ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 8/4/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED000385

2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). 7137

3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

4. AUTHOR(S): Newburn, H.K.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Faculty Personnel Policies in State Universities

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

TYPE OF REPORT
- PROPOSAL ☐
- IN-PROGRESS ☐
- FINAL ☒
- FOLLOW-UP ☐

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Montana State Univ.
ST. Missoula, Montana
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE Montana State University

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	59	160

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR survey

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

surveys Y-18A	teaching benefits Y-23		
teachers Y-21	recruitment P-32		
administration R-06	public schools P-26		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Report of interviews on campuses of 11 State universities selected as a cross-section sample of State universities in United States. Range of subjects: Recruitment and appointment; promotion; the role of the faculty and of the administrator in personnel activities; the provision of proper work conditions; and observations on faculty personnel policies and programs. Bibliography.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

IV-9

7137

Faculty Personnel Policies In State Universities

H. K. NEWBURN
PRESIDENT
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

MISSOULA -:- MONTANA

ED 000 385

FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
IN STATE UNIVERSITIES

H. K. NEWBURN

President, Montana State University

Multilithed for Limited Distribution at
Montana State University, Missoula, Montana,
October, 1959.

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE III

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. FINDING AND SECURING THE PERSONNEL: RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT 9

III. RECOGNIZING PERSONNEL: PROMOTION IN RANK 23

IV. THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY IN PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES 41

V. THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR IN PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES . . . 58

VI. PROVIDING PROPER CONDITIONS OF WORK 81

VII. OBSERVATIONS ON FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS . . 110

BIBLIOGRAPHY 146

APPENDIX 148

PREFACE

This multilith edition of the report is designed to serve two purposes. In the first place, it affords the means for the writer to complete his commitments to the universities he visited by providing them at a relatively early date with a summary of his observations and reactions to the experience. In the second place, the report is being sent to other leaders in higher education in the hope that they also will study it and forward to the writer their critical reactions. Primarily, these reactions from the field will be assessed in an effort to determine whether there is likely to be sufficient interest in the statement to justify the publication of an edition designed for more widespread distribution.

The writer, therefore, urges each of those who have the opportunity to review the report to write indicating his impressions and specifically to suggest whether he believes the material should be made available to several thousand persons rather than to the several hundred who may read this edition. This, of course, applies to personnel in the universities visited as well as to those others to whom the report has been forwarded.

It is difficult for the writer to put into words his sincere appreciation of the courtesy and consideration with which he was received by the administrators and staff members who arranged the details of visitation on each of the campuses, and his indebtedness to those 348 faculty members who participated in the interviews. Suffice it to say that the combined influence of such persons made this past year one of the most enjoyable and interesting of his adult life. It is hoped that in some small measure this volume of comments will help to repay the participants for their time and effort.

The author also wishes to thank The Ford Foundation and The Fund for the Advancement of Education for making the visits possible. Particularly, he desires to express appreciation to Henry T. Heald, President of The Ford Foundation, and to Clarence H. Faust, Vice-President of The Ford Foundation and President of The Fund for the Advancement of Education, for their part in the enterprise. While they are in no way responsible for the report as such, their interest in the project and their willingness to give the writer complete freedom in his approach to the problem were and are most gratifying.

The author cannot refrain from expressing the hope that, regardless of other outcomes, the experiences reported herein might serve to aid him as he embarks again upon the rather choppy seas of university administration.

Missoula, Montana
September 26, 1959

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The data for this report were collected by the writer through personal interviews conducted on the main campuses of 11 state universities between October, 1958, and May, 1959. The institutions were selected to provide a general cross-section sample of the state universities in the United States. While geographical location was not a primary factor, they are well scattered across the country. If the classification followed in the Walters report[1] is used, they are distributed in the various sections as indicated below:

Northeastern	2	South Atlantic	1
Mid Atlantic	0	East South Central	0
East North Central	2	West South Central	1
West North Central	2	Mountain	2
		Pacific	1

The universities vary in size over almost the full range of enrollment in such institutions. The smallest reports a registration of fewer than 3,000, and the largest well over 25,000 students. The sampling tends to be somewhat heavy at the upper levels of the enrollment range. Certainly, as compared with enrollments for all institutions of higher education, the sample includes no really small units. If grouped by full-time enrollments reported for the fall of 1958, the institutions classify as indicated below:

Under	2	10,001 - 15,000	2
5001 - 10,000	3	15,001 - 20,000	4
		Over 20,000	2

In terms of full-time professional staff,[2] again almost the entire range for state universities is included, with the smallest institution reporting approximately 275, and the largest, over 1,500. The total number of staff reported by the 11 is better than 8,000. The institutions can be grouped as follows on the basis of professional staff:

Under 300	2	600 - 1,000	3
301 - 600	3	Over 1,000	3

---

[1] Raymond Walters, "Statistics of Attendance in American Universities and Colleges," School & Society, 86:2142 (Dec. 6, 1958), p. 428.

[2] The staff count includes only regular professors, associate professors, assistant professors and instructors in each case.

Three of the universities visited are parts of a state-wide university system with multiple campuses governed by a single board which operates through a chief executive officer. Each of the campuses which function under this pattern has its own executive officer more or less responsible for the institution under his general direction. A fourth university shares its board with other state institutions but does not act as a part of a total state system in the sense of centralized administrative direction.

The university senate, which is described usually as the legislative unit of the university on the academic or educational side, is composed of practically all regular faculty members in two of the universities, and two others, while not calling it the senate, look upon the general university faculty for the same responsibilities. The other seven have smaller representative university senates which exercise delegated legislative powers and which are selected from (ordinarily elected by) the total university faculty. Sometimes such agencies are required to report action back to the university faculty for approval before such legislation is effective. In the four institutions where the faculty as a whole serves as the legislative agency, there is either one or several smaller senate advisory committees to work with the administration in a general or specialized capacity.

Generally speaking, the senate as such takes little direct responsibility in the area of faculty personnel, except possibly in connection with infringements of academic freedom and tenure. Only one instance comes to mind where a senate committee is constituted to take formal action and make recommendations in specific cases involving appointments, promotions and merit salary adjustments.

Two of the universities have no vice-presidents, provosts or deans of faculties, and in a third the provost is in reality the executive head of the main university campus. One institution has an academic vice-president who works with personnel upon assignment by the president, but has no line responsibility, and in another the vice-president and provost has no responsibility for academic personnel. The remaining six universities have vice-presidents, vice-chancellors or provosts (some of whom carry also the title of dean of faculties) who assume varying amounts of authority and exercise varying responsibility for administration of faculty personnel.

The purpose of the visits was announced to the presidents of the institutions by letter early in the fall of 1958. They were informed that the writer desired to inquire into the personnel policies being followed in connection with recruitment, appointment, promotion, tenure and salary provisions, provisions for faculty welfare, retirement and separation from the university, as they relate to the professional staff. They were further informed that the data were to be collected through a series of personal interviews conducted by the writer, and that these would include efforts to ascertain attitudes toward and reactions to the policies as they work out in practice. All twelve[3] presidents agreed readily to the visit and indicated that correspondence should be continued either with them personally or with a designated representative.

In outlining more specifically the details of the visitation, the writer indicated that personnel in medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry were not to be included, but that representatives from all other units on the main campus should be involved. It was suggested that the schedule be established on an hourly basis which provided for an average of approximately 50 minutes per interview. (The actual range of formal interview time was from 30 to 75 minutes, and a number of informal conferences covered considerably longer periods of time.) It was suggested that, for the most part, the interviews should be conducted in a central location in order to conserve on time and avoid distractions.

The person responsible for the scheduling of interviews was asked to arrange meetings with the president, and with other officials in top administration concerned with faculty personnel, the graduate dean and the dean of the liberal arts college. In addition, it was suggested that at least three other deans of academic areas be included, selected to give a variety of approaches to the personnel problem, if such variation existed.

"In addition," the request stated, "I would like to speak to five or six department heads scattered among several schools with at least three in liberal arts (one in the sciences, one in the social studies and one in the humanities), five or six professors who are not department heads, five or six associate professors, and five or six assistant professors. The order of the interviews is not too important."

It was suggested that the sample include top people and, if possible, those with definite opinions in the area of personnel policy. The group was to include people relatively new to the campus and others who had been around some time; also some who were new to their present rank and others with considerable experience at the present level. Representatives of important committees dealing with faculty personnel matters were to be involved. In general, the schools and colleges were to be accorded representation in the sample roughly in terms of the size of their respective faculty groups.

---

[3] Unfortunately, the twelfth university had to be eliminated because of the pressure of time.

The following additional data were requested and received from each of the eleven universities:

1. A list of all full professors as of September, 1958, including the following information on each:
    - a. Age.
    - b. Date of first appointment to the university.
    - c. Rank at first appointment.
    - d. Date of changes in rank (for example, "to assistant professor 1942, associate professor 1946, full professor 1954").

2. A list of new appointments to the staff (four ranks) effective 1958-59 along with departments schools or colleges and rank.

3. A list of all promotions for 1958 along with the department, school or college, the change involved (for example, "from assistant professor to associate professor"), and the number of years of service at the rank from which promoted.

4. The total number of persons holding each of the four ranks in September, 1958.

Each school was provided with copies of an outline incorporating the general nature of the content to be covered during the course of the visits to the institutions.[4]

The interviews were conducted on the campuses beginning October 14, 1958, and extending through April 28, 1959. The stay on the individual campus varied from a week to 12 days, exclusive of travel time to and from the institution.

The total number of persons interviewed formally in the 11 institutions was 348. The number interviewed per institution varied from 22 to 39 and the average was 32. The groups listed below were represented in the sample as indicated:

All university administrators	28
Academic deans (including associate and assistant deans)	64

---

[4] See appendix, pp. 149-155.

Department heads[5]	(79)
Full professors	150
Associate professors	62
Assistant professors	44
TOTAL	348

In general, the sample was constituted about as had been anticipated. The heavy representation of full professors results from the fact that most department heads are full professors, and since it was desirable to see at least a half dozen full professors, not department heads, in addition to a like number of department heads, the large total resulted. The representation of assistant professors is smaller than originally anticipated because it was difficult to find personnel at this rank sufficiently conversant with the general university situation to make a meaningful contribution. Actually, the representatives in the upper two ranks were generally able to contribute considerably more than their junior colleagues, as might have been anticipated.

The spread of representation over the campus was generally good and roughly approximated the size of the areas involved. No effort was made to establish this representation statistically, however. While it is difficult to establish such matters with any real degree of validity, the writer was most pleased with the general attitude of those interviewed. Such checks as he was able to make, and such informal reports as came to him supported the judgment that the great majority of those consulted gave their opinions and their information freely and objectively. In fact, the one quality which seemed most to characterize the attitude of those interviewed was their extreme interest in the discussion and the real pleasure they seemed to derive from such participation. Each person interviewed was assured in the beginning that none of his comments would be attributed to him personally as the report was prepared for publication, although many indicated they would have no objection to being associated directly with any comments they might make during the interview. They were also told that the specific universities involved would not be referred to by name in any report growing out of the visitation. Undoubtedly, these commitments had something to do with the freedom of expression which typified the interviews throughout the visitation period.

While the interviews generally followed the outline submitted in advance as a content guide, their nature varied materially from person to person, depending upon such factors as rank or position held, total term of service in higher education, total period of service locally, and the character of associations with committees or other groups participating directly in faculty personnel operations.

---

[5] This group is not added to the total since each is also included by professional rank under the proper heading.

For example, in talking with presidents, provosts, and deans, emphasis was placed on the general policies and procedures followed, their personal roles in the program, their relationships with other administrators and the faculty, and similar matters of general import. The department heads were requested to report in considerable detail the manner in which their specific departments operate in securing, advancing, rewarding, and otherwise working with the faculty involved. Practices and procedures were given relatively greater emphasis here than in interviews with the central administrative staff, although policy matters were not neglected. At this point, too, the role of the department head and his relationship with staff were examined critically and in considerable detail.

Senior staff members with long-term service locally were especially helpful in reviewing the total operation as they had watched and participated in its development. They also proved especially beneficial in describing the manner in which policies were working out in practice within departmental environs, and in describing relationships between staff and administration in the past as well as the present. Both senior and junior staff who were relatively new to the local situation were able to compare their impressions of the present situation with the former university or college in which they had worked. Younger faculty members were queried as well on their reasons for accepting appointment to the local staff, and their impressions of the qualifications which seemed to be important at this time as well as those they believe necessary to advance normally in rank and tenure status. They also assisted materially by reporting their attitudes and beliefs relative to the location of authority and responsibility for decisions relating to personnel matters.

Few of the questions asked could be given "yes" or "no" answers. In fact, the advantage of this type of interview is its adaptability to questioning in depth. The interviewer could adapt his queries to the experience and knowledge of the consultant in each case, and thus when a fertile area opened up during the conference, could pursue the field until he was satisfied that nothing more of value was forthcoming. The writer did not hesitate to follow such leads at times even at the expense of failure to cover the entire area under consideration. As a result, it was possible to be more certain of the real attitude of the respondent, and to double check the accuracy of all statements. While the entire procedure was highly subjective and consciously so, this ability to probe into responses until the interviewer was satisfied that he understood what his confrere was attempting to communicate, should lend greater reliability to such an approach than ordinarily is associated with it.

Clearly, this investigation is not quantitative in nature and is not based upon wide-ranging statistical data. It purports to be nothing more than the carefully developed reactions of a single observer to the conditions existing with regard to faculty personnel in 11 state universities, based upon informal personal conferences with 348 of the personnel working in these institutions. If the report has any value it undoubtedly comes from the consistency with which it is recognized that the summaries, generalizations, and recommendations are based upon the judgments of a single individual who, in turn, secured the materials upon which his reactions are based from the expressed judgments, stated attitudes, and voiced opinions of others. While extreme care has been used in an effort not to read into such data more than is implied by the direct statement, and while the writer has attempted in every way possible to be objective in his approach, the data are largely subjective and have been treated as such. The writer believes there is need occasionally for this type of approach, to educational problems as complex as this one, and especially when the problem is still somewhat unexplored.

It is important, however, that both the approach and the considerable limitations affecting the study be kept in mind as the report is considered.

Certain liberties taken in the use of technical terminology should be explained in the beginning. The decision in each case was based on a desire to reduce potential ambiguities to a minimum, and to avoid confusion on the part of the reader wherever possible.

The term *liberal arts college* or *college of liberal arts* is used consistently to refer to that unit of the university which engages in providing liberal and general education, as contrasted with professional training, to its students. Such divisions are known by a variety of names, such as *The College of Literature, Sciences and the Arts*, *The Literary College*, *The College of Arts and Sciences*, and so on. It is hoped that this simplification in terminology will be accepted as justifiable under the circumstances.

The terms *department head* and *department chairman* are treated interchangeably although, in practice, there is a tendency to reserve the latter usage for those positions which are less permanent in nature, or carry less responsibility and authority than are given to the *department head*. In this text they are treated as being synonymous in nature, and refer in every case to the departmental executive officer without regard to the nature or extent of his authority, or the length of his term of office.

Where the term *chancellor* is used, it is treated as equivalent to *president*. This is made necessary by the fact that three of the universities visited are part either of a state system involving several institutions or of a multi-unit institution referred to as the state university. In all three institutions, the head of the university or of the main university in the case of the multi-unit institution, is known as the chancellor, and the executive officer of the entire system or the total university, as the president. Since in these institutions the chancellor exercises pretty much the responsibility usually associated with the presidency, the two titles can be used as synonymous to each other.

The terms faculty and administration are used consistently to refer to specific groups of personnel. The teaching staff is called the faculty, and the staff charged with administering or managing the institution, the administration. The writer is well aware that the term faculty officially and formally is all-inclusive and embraces the entire professional staff of the university, teachers and administrators as well. The usage followed in this report is dictated entirely by convenience and should in no way be taken as recognition of the existence of two separate bodies motivated by separate aspirations, interest or goals, and operating in a somewhat antagonistic pose, one to the other. In fact, the writer was so desirous of avoiding this implication that, in the beginning, he used different sets of terminology for the two groups, but found it impossible to arrive at phrases which would have the functional acceptance of those finally employed. It seemed best to talk of faculty and administration as though they were in reality two separate groups, and attempt to correct any misunderstanding in this fashion.

Chapter II

FINDING AND SECURING THE PERSONNEL: RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT

The 11 universities reported 726 new appointments for the fall of 1958 within the four ranks considered in this review. This is approximately one out of every ten of the total staff within these ranks, and emphasizes the considerable task involved annually in securing adequate replacements and additions.

Table I shows the appointments made in each of the universities distributed among the various ranks. Clearly the great majority of the new faculty come to these institutions as "junior staff" members, since 75 per cent of the total number are employed as instructors and assistant professors. In six of the universities less than one out of every ten appointed came as full professors, and in four of these schools, fewer than one in five were placed in the upper two ranks. Actually, two universities secured about 90 per cent of their new staff as instructors or assistant professors. In one institution one of every two persons employed was at the rank of instructor. The range in per cent of appointments made at the two lower levels varied from 53.2 per cent to 90.7 per cent.

On the other hand, in two institutions almost half of the appointments were made at the upper two levels, and three universities made no appointments at all as instructors. The range in appointments at the two upper levels varied from 9.3 to 46.8 per cent.

Table 2 gives the range in per cent of total appointments at the various ranks among the 11 institutions. In the three universities where no instructors were appointed, the percentage of acquisitions at the assistant professor level was quite high, being 60.0, 68.0, and 71.7 per cent, respectively.

Table 2

Range in Per Cent of Total Appointments at Various Ranks

Rank	Range Among Institutions
Full professor	2.3 to 29.8
Associate professor	7.0 to 28.0
Assistant professor	16.2 to 71.7
Instructor	0.0 to 67.6

Table 1

NEW APPOINTMENTS FOR 1958-59

Number Univ.	Professor				Associate Professor				Assistant Professor				Instructor				TOT. NO.
	L.A.	Prfs.	Tot.	%	L.A.	Prfs.	Tot.	%	L.A.	Prfs.	Tot.	%	L.A.	Prfs.	Tot.	%	
I	0	1	1	2.3	0	3	3	7.0	6	10	16	37.2	4	19	23	53.5	43
II	5	7	12	15.0	4	6	10	12.5	18	13	31	38.7	17	10	27	33.8	80
III	1	4	5	15.2	2	2	4	12.1	5	5	10	30.3	7	7	14	42.4	33
IV	0	1	1	2.9	1	2	3	8.8	8	5	13	38.3	11	6	17	50.0	34
V	1	0	1	4.0	7	0	7	28.0	10	7	17	68.0	0	0	0	0	25
VI	1	3	4	7.5	2	9	11	20.8	20	18	38	71.7	0	0	0	0	53
VII	4	9	13	8.1	5	8	13	8.1	18	8	26	16.2	65	43	108	67.6	160
VIII	1	3	4	4.7	2	9	11	12.8	14	13	27	31.4	20	24	44	51.1	86
IX	9	4	13	22.6	9	2	11	18.4	21	15	36	60.0	0	0	0	0	60
X	10	18	28	29.8	5	11	16	17.0	9	11	20	21.3	16	14	30	31.9	94
XI	5	1	6	10.3	5	2	7	12.1	11	5	16	27.6	13	16	29	50.0	58
TOTALS	37	51	88	12	42	54	96	13	140	110	250	35	153	139	292	40	726

It is difficult to study these data without coming to the conclusion that the trend of employment, if continued over a period of years, will have a distinct effect upon the character of the institutions involved. Some are adding very few staff at the upper two levels, while others are tending to concentrate heavily at this point. Presumably, an institution to be most adequately staffed will show a somewhat balanced distribution among the various ranks, particularly from assistant professor upward. If anything, strength would appear to reside in that institution which has more associate and full professors than it does personnel in the lower two ranks. On the other hand, if too large a proportion of the faculty are professors and associate professors, staff mobility within the institution is seriously affected, and, as a consequence, its general quality. One can only wonder how much of the pattern of employment is fortuitous and how much it is dictated by conscious planning in each case. At any rate, it is something which should be made the subject of formal study on every campus.

Variations in appointments to the staff in liberal arts colleges as contrasted with those in the professional schools is very slight as shown in Table 3. The colleges of liberal arts appoint a slightly larger proportion to the two lower ranks (79 per cent as compared to 70 per cent), and a somewhat smaller percentage at the upper levels. It should be pointed out, however, that there is not only considerable difference in the practices among professional schools, but also among the various departments in the colleges of liberal arts.

Table 3

Per Cent of Appointments at Various Ranks for Liberal Arts and Professional Schools

Rank	Liberal Arts	Professional Schools	TOTAL
Professor	10	14	12
Associate Professor	11	16	13
Assistant Professor	38	31	35
Instructor	41	39	40

Procedure

The machinery for recruitment and appointment, except in terms of roles played by various key persons, does not vary a great deal from place to place, at least through its early stages. Basically, the problem of recruitment is a departmental matter[1] which ordinarily involves the following steps:

1. The recognition of an existing vacancy.
2. A more or less detailed definition of the position including the special area of content involved, maximum rank, maximum salary and other such details.
3. Administrative approval to recruit within the definition of the position accepted at the top.
4. The initiation of contacts with potential candidates.
5. The collection of more or less detailed dossiers on the potential candidates.
6. The development of a selected panel of possibilities.
7. The rating and ranking of the selected panel.
8. The decision, the recommendation, and its approval.

Basically, a vacancy occurs in either of two ways. On the one hand, an existing position may be vacated and thus demand a replacement, or, on the other, a new position may be created due to increased load or a desire to strengthen the staff regardless of enrollment or other such demands.

Obviously, in the latter case it is necessary to convince the upper administrative echelons of the need, and to secure from them the necessary addition to the departmental budget before an appointment can be made. It also becomes necessary in many schools to secure administrative approval for the replacement of an existing position before any action is taken.

In at least one institution, as a matter of policy, it is required that the department and the college demonstrate the need to fill any spot left vacant by the retirement or resignation of a staff member. Frequently, it is policy to grade down such vacancies before a replacement is made. In some institutions it is practice to replace staff at the next lower rank, and in others, to appoint all staff at the lowest rank regardless of the present level of the position. In one institution, all vacancies are frozen by the governor and cannot be filled until approval has been given following a filing of need. While such approval has been pro forma to date, the fact that need must be demonstrated requires top level administrative approval before a replacement may be recommended.

---

[1] It should be recognized that except for the colleges of liberal arts, only a few of the basic units (engineering, agriculture, business administration, and, sometimes, education) are departmentalized. In most of the smaller areas such as pharmacy, the dean also assumes the role of department head. In speaking of departments throughout the report, the author is referring to these smaller schools or colleges within the universities, as well as to the more autonomous departmental units of the complex college organization.

The degree to which deans and general administrative officers require a detailed demonstration of need varies, of course, with the level of the appointment. Frequently, the appointment of instructors or even assistant professors, within the limitations of the approved budget for the department, is simply assumed by all concerned, particularly in such areas as English, where a heavy load of freshman or sophomore instruction is carried largely by such staff members. On the other hand, proposed appointments at the upper two ranks, particularly if they are staff additions, are likely to require considerable support and explanation from the department before the search for a candidate will have official blessing.

Once administrative approval is given, the search begins in earnest. Since most of the appointments are made at lower ranks, the great majority of the candidates are those who are about to complete their doctorates (or other terminal degrees), or only recently have acquired such badges of readiness for academic life. This means that the great graduate institutions of the country, or more exactly selected staff members in these institutions, provide the prime source of contacts.[2] Most departments or departmental chairmen have their own special list of institutions, personal friends, or acquaintances in such institutions in whom they have confidence, and to whom they turn for suggestions. Those who can afford it ask for nominations of two or three of the top men; those who can be less demanding call for suggestions of good or able men, and the others just write and hope for the best.

It is disappointing to find so little advance planning for recruitment. Most departments find it a sufficient task simply to keep up with the year-to-year needs of the area. Such evidences of building personnel to a long range plan, or of developing continuing personnel prospect files as were observed are less than institutional in scope and are far too infrequent in number. If one is inclined to agree with the dean of a professional school in one of the universities visited that, "It takes as long to pick a professor as it does to build a building," this situation gives little cause for comfort.

Generally speaking, some of the best planning for staff requirements seems to take place in the schools of law. Clearly, the problem is easier to encompass in this area than in many others, but this factor is offset considerably by the extreme competition for the small number of top men who are interested in teaching. The following quotation from a law dean illustrates the point:

---

[2] Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, in discussing problems of recruiting staff, point out that in the institutions included in their study, "Not even as a last resort will they recruit from institutions with prestige levels much below their own." The Academic Marketplace, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

> "We spend time continually in anticipation of needs. We try to have specific men in mind for each position before it opens. Two years ago we got a little extra money for staff and were able to appoint the men the very day the funds were made available. We build our files by writing all the good schools relative to their graduates each year, because normally we hire young people who have been out three or four years.
>
> "We have a committee on personnel but we parcel the job out. We write about a dozen schools and build up our files in this manner. We meet a number of these young men at our annual meeting in Chicago. The whole faculty participates in such interviews. Our entire faculty with two exceptions attended the meeting this year, and one of their major assignments was to help in developing what we have come to call our 'stud book'."

A dean of agriculture reports that they try to anticipate vacancies in an official manner. He asks his department heads, "Suppose this man leaves, who would take over?" They try to think three deep in all their major areas.

A geology head who has been successful in securing and retaining staff reports, "I worry more about the appointment of men than anything else. I've been hunting for a man to fill a particular position now for over a year."

The best advanced planning for staff in the liberal arts area, however, was reported by a chairman of political science who said:

> "We have an elaborate personnel file which includes all Ph.D.'s since the war. At convention meetings we check on young people. We have complete dossiers on the younger ones. We have both a small information card and a more comprehensive folder on each kept up to date. Let us say we need a man in administration - we pull out approximately 40 cards for preliminary consideration, and gradually reduce consideration to from three to six men just from reference to our files and discussion. It takes about a half-time secretary to manage this file."

In another institution, the writer was given a copy of a detailed report developed by a committee in the English department, which attempts to anticipate the long-term needs of this area both from the curricular and the personnel viewpoints. Other such activities could be mentioned, and while they are most commendable, to be most effective plans must be larger than a department or even a college in scope. There is too little evidence of long-range institutional planning in the personnel area.[3]

From the lists of possible candidates there is eventually developed a preferred group or a panel of potential candidates for the post. These candidates are ranked in order pretty largely on the basis of the record, and ordinarily without much personal knowledge of the individuals involved. Competition being what it is today, the preferred lists are sometimes quite small, occasionally permitting no choice at all. In other words, more and more frequently the department is fortunate to come up with a single, well-qualified person available for the post.

All institutions would like to invite the candidate, or better yet, two or three of them to visit the campus, meet the staff and administration, and otherwise make himself visible. In several institutions this is possible even to the extent of bringing in several potentialities for a single post. In others it is possible only to a very limited degree, and in some it cannot be done at all. Substitutes are found for such visitation including, as was quoted above, conferences at national meetings, recruiting trips by staff members, and conversations with friends of local faculty who know the candidate well. The element of personal contact in advance of employment leaves much to be desired in many cases, however, as is indicated by the remark of a dean in a relatively small professional school who mentioned passing a stranger in the hall early in the school year and later learning he was a new faculty member in his unit!

The timing of appointments is an important, and occasionally, a critical matter. One of the general problems of state universities is the inevitable delay pending the allocation of budget funds by the state legislature. In most institutions this affects the budget only every other year, but in some it is an annual problem. Some legislatures are slower to make up their minds than others, and they vary from year to year in terms of economic or political pressures.[4]

---

[3] Caplow and McGee found this weakness characteristic of departmental operations as well. "Few departments practice the most effect technique for getting the men they want: that of selecting them in advance of the need for their services," they say at one point. A little later in talking about the vagueness of certain responses "About the effect of appointments on the department's long-range program," they surmise the explanation is based on "the fact that departments seldom have long-range programs," Ibid., pp. 144 and 170.

[4] This statement is being written the early part of June in Ann Arbor, Michigan. At this late date, the Michigan legislature has given very little attention to next year's budgets for the state

Coupled with this fact is the tendency for appointments to be made by many institutions at an earlier date than ever before. The chairman of an English department, for example, after indicating the extent to which he and his colleagues have been using the annual meeting of the Modern Languages Association as a time for recruiting potential staff members who later are invited to the campus for interviews, indicates that too many of the better prospects are committed for the next year in advance of these December sessions. Thus, he plans a recruiting visit to graduate schools in the fall of next year to develop prospects for the following year and soon he may be able to use the Association meeting as a place to greet the new staff already selected to come to the university nine months hence!

What is it these institutions are seeking in the newly-appointed staff member? Again, it is necessary to differentiate between those appointed at the lower ranks and those who enter service at one of the two upper levels.

The reports summarized earlier in Table 1 indicate that 75 per cent of the new appointments made are in the ranks of instructor or assistant professor. These are the levels that ordinarily are filled by young people just completing graduate or advanced professional education or who, at best, have been in the field a very short time. Most of the comments to follow relating to the qualifications required will apply to this group of young and relatively inexperienced individuals who are dependent pretty largely on their graduate records plus recommendations from their professors to support their candidacies.

Actually, most of the institutions studied look upon the appointment of an instructor or assistant professor potentially as the acquisition of a permanent member of the staff, and thus the difference in qualifications is more one of degree than of kind. Apparently, the associate or full professor is expected to have "more of the same," or possibly to have demonstrated the possession of the desired traits where the junior staff member is taken on faith or as a result of his ability to demonstrate a "potential" to perform as required.

One in four of the staff acquired by the 11 institutions in 1958 was appointed at the upper two ranks. In the acquisition of such senior staff members, it is clear that the qualifications are quite similar to those which relate to promotion of staff to senior rank once they are

---

institutions of higher education. The administration thus faces the dilemma of approving appointments in the absence of any definite budget knowledge, or continuing to delay them while the better personnel is selected by other schools. While this year is a bit unusual, to say the least, it does serve to point up the problem nicely.

attached to the university. These requirements are discussed in detail in Chapter III and will not be treated here. The comments to follow, and for that matter the procedures in appointment discussed above, should be thought of as applying particularly to persons quite new to university activity, and ordinarily appointed at junior levels.

As might be expected, in almost all of the cases, two major qualifications are mentioned, namely, 1) teaching ability or aptitude, and 2) ability or potential to do research and to publish. A third factor, which is not mentioned frequently in published criteria but which is given a great deal of weight by the department chairmen and by the teaching staff as well, is that of ability to get along with one's colleagues - to "play on the team," so to speak.[5] A more detailed analysis of this quality is presented in Chapter III.

For the most part, teaching ability can only be assumed from indirect evidence, since many of the appointments are made directly out of graduate school where the candidate has had little opportunity to demonstrate teaching ability. Actually, most of the assessment in this area comes from 1) reports obtained from colleagues who know the candidate although may never have seen him teach, and 2) observation of the candidate in situations which are thought to approximate the teaching act, such as a lecture before his peers or even group conversation. The writer is so impressed with the lack of objective data on teaching ability at the time of the appointments that he is inclined to suggest either it is assumed or hoped for as an accompaniment of the Ph.D., or the attainment of one's majority, or that it really isn't considered to be of great importance regardless of what is said to the contrary. Some people, not so kindly disposed, are suggesting that we are only giving lip service to teaching and that it really does not matter particularly at the time of appointment; but more of this later.[6]

---

[5] A more detailed treatment of this problem is presented by Lloyd S. Woodburne in his earlier volume, *Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education*, Harper & Brothers, Chapter 4 In fact, the entire book is worthy of perusal since he reports on visits made in 1947 and 1948 to 46 institutions in an effort to evaluate the personnel policies of these schools. While his visits and thus his coverage were made on a less intensive basis than was the present study, the comparison of findings is most interesting. Woodburne visited seven universities also included in this study.

[6] Caplow and McGee after reporting that "teaching is regarded more and more casually" (*op. cit.*, p. 146) say this can be and frequently is explained on one of two bases "(1) Teaching doesn't matter - it isn't important; and (2) there's nothing to worry about - any Ph.D. can teach." (*op. cit.*, p. 159)

For the new and young appointee, the factor of research and publication must be evaluated largely in terms of potential, since, for the most part, it is unlikely even that the candidate's dissertation has been published. Where the applicant has published, it is a relatively simple matter to secure a copy of his publications and have them evaluated by someone who knows the field. On the other hand, it is a little easier to secure a valid subjective judgment on the potential of the candidate here, than it is on the teaching side. At least his major professor knows first hand something of his aptitude for and potential in the area of research and writing. The only problem here is to know the reduction factor necessary in each case to allow properly for the tendency to over-value one's own students.[7]

One is curious about the results achieved by one of the institutions visited where each observer of a candidate visiting the campus (who also is presumed to have read his curriculum vitae) is asked to report to the responsible dean his rating on a four-point scale (excellent, good, fair, poor), first on teaching and then on research. Fortunately, the respondent is also given the opportunity to check that he needs more information.

In the case of the young man with little or no experience either in teaching or research (particularly publication), it would appear that most appointments involve the selection of an individual with a good-to-excellent record in one of the better graduate departments, who has the support of the staff at this institution (and usually a particular professor is involved), who seems to be interested in research and publication, who is willing to try his hand at teaching, and who appears personally pretty well adapted to work in the department and the institution involved.[8] As has been said, it is either assumed or hoped that he will be able to teach at least well enough not to attract too many unfavorable comments. How selective the institution can be in the items mentioned above depends almost entirely upon its competitive situation in comparison with similar institutions. When Caplow and McGee report that "even under the best conditions the evaluation of a candidate is beset with uncertainty,"[9] it is not at all difficult to agree with these gentlemen.

---

[7] "Professors do not, in general, overrate departments other than their own" (op. cit., p. 104). It may be inferred, therefore, that along with the tendency to over value their own departments goes a habit of overrating their own Ph.D. candidates. There also is the problem of placement to consider: no professor wishes to develop a reputation for failure to place his students.

[8] Even though employing officials indicate a lack of confidence in written recommendations, considerable weight is placed on such documents. In many cases, however, an increasing emphasis is given to oral contacts with recommending dignitaries either through personal conversations or by telephonic communication. The written record continues to be emphasized, however, particularly in those places where visitation to the campus for interviews is not possible. Obviously, there is more personal knowledge of the individual under consideration for appointment at senior rank and greater likelihood of campus visitation and interview before a decision is reached.

It is very difficult to generalize the attitude toward "inbreeding" when it is defined as taking one's own graduates immediately upon completion of terminal degrees. None of the institutions has a formal prohibition of such employment on a university-wide base. Within the universities, examples can be found of departments or schools varying from almost one extreme to another. Certain areas are pointed out as centers of excessive inbreeding and are considered to be weaker for it. Some divisions, like one of the law schools, provide for a definite proportion of their own graduates, in this case 50 per cent of the total. Some departments emphasize the fact that they have found it necessary to educate their own men and that only in this manner are they able to secure the kind and quality of staff demanded in their setting. Others make it clear that even the teaching fellows, who are working toward doctorates, will not be retained after completing these degrees, as a matter of policy.

Some institutions, while not prohibiting the practice, apparently frown on it. There is considerable objection in such settings to this point of view, particularly now that competition for staff is so active. Professors or department heads point out it is necessary to turn to the outside for personnel when many times they are graduating superior persons in their own doctoral programs. Observation would

---

Woodburne, in his earlier study, and Caplow and McGee more recently, take a rather negative view toward the written recommendation. The former says "the consensus of forty-six of the best colleges and schools in the country is clear and practically unanimous. They dare not trust any recommendation, without separate verification, unless they know the individual making the statement and know they can rely on his word." (op. cit., p. 3) Caplow and McGee are a little more kind when they report that "recommendations are read primarily in an attempt to ascertain the disciplinary prestige of the candidate." (op. cit. p. 121)

[9] Op. cit., p. 126. They further state (p. 127) "it is not an overgeneralization to say that departments do not, as a rule, consider teaching, academic record, or theses." And finally, they generalize, "men are hired, to put it boldly, on the basis of how good they will look to others." (p. 128)

indicate the existence of a generally healthful attitude in this regard, with notable exceptions where a department has gone overboard in the direction of either extreme. For the most part, the attitude is that of selecting the best qualified man, regardless of his alma mater. This general approach is modified, many times, when it is clear that a department is overloaded with staff from a particular graduate school including the local institution. Some departments also tend to limit their search to candidates from a few highly-selected graduate schools where they believe superior education in this field of effort is being provided.

Uniformly, all staff appointments must be approved by the institution's board of trustees upon the recommendation of the proper authorities including, of course, the chief executive officer. The appointment, while not official until such board approval has been given, usually is a fait accompli when it has been approved by the president's office, assuming funds are available and the position authorized in the budget. It is rare indeed for the board to do more than approve such appointments pro forma when the circumstances are correct. Most of the time, the budget carrying the position has been approved in advance and the governing body simply accepts a list of appointments which are recommended to fill such positions. Occasionally, an executive officer may want to call attention to a special case, or a board member may have questions regarding particular appointments, but ordinarily if funds are available and the appointment is in keeping with policy, it is approved officially without comment, indeed, without specific attention to the case but rather as a part of the total personnel lists.

Uniformly, it is agreed that more time should be spent in the field spotting possibilities at an early date. Several people suggest the desirability of providing regular recruiting teams which would pay frequent visits to highly regarded graduate and professional units seeking out first-rate possibilities months in advance of actual need. Such a suggestion usually is tied to the idea of more satisfactory long-range planning for staff needs. It is believed that such expeditions would more than pay for themselves in terms of reducing the turnover, and thus the cost both in terms of dollars and effectiveness involved in replacements.

Generally, there is great interest in more adequate arrangements for visitation and interview on the campus. This is believed desirable both from the candidate's point of view and from that of the institution involved as well. Very little real credence is placed in written evaluations of the candidate's fitness for the post. Also, with so much emphasis being placed on the desirability of appointing personnel who will fit into the department and the institution on a personal basis, there naturally follows a belief that an opportunity to analyze the man on the scene is most desirable. Such visitation also gives the candidate a chance to view the situation and his colleagues first hand. As one professor put it, like David Copperfield, "he holds up a mirror before himself and thinks he sees a divine image," but even so, such experience is desirable.

This problem of "like begetting like" is a real one. One man put it, "first-class men select first-class men, and second-class men appoint third-class colleagues." Even though under such circumstances, the problem of upgrading may be a difficult one, it certainly is not enhanced by the personal interview, and possibly because such persons are reviewed by a wide variety of local people, it may be considerably alleviated as a result.

Most staff people believe it is unwise to limit replacements to lower rank personnel. They suggest instead the substitution of a policy already followed in some of the universities which ordinarily assumes such practice but encourages deviations for cause. In fact, one of the common criticisms of employment practice is that it doesn't provide sufficiently for the acquisition of really outstanding personnel which would put the "top" on the department's program. In those two or three institutions which encourage and provide for such possibilities, uniformly satisfactory results are reported.

While this is a very difficult matter to judge, there is evidence not only of necessity at times to settle for less than they would like in terms of quality, but actually for less quality than it might be possible to secure. A president in one of the more adequately financed institutions says he "keeps urging for a breaking through of the cautious faculty approach. Even the deans and the vice-presidents are cautious about bringing in people who do not fit into pattern or who must be paid out of line with others of the same rank." He has urged them to appoint either "top, mature men with national reputations, or brilliant young men, and to leave positions open rather than fill them with the less able." As will be said in discussing faculty participation, there is a considerable conservative trend in personnel actions, particularly those which come from committee decisions. This is noticeable in appointment activity as well as in other aspects of the area. It creates difficulty in putting a real "top" on a staff.

The less well-supported institutions are finding it very difficult to secure the quality of staff desired in the face of mounting competion from industry as well as other educational institutions. A graduate dean, for example, after stating he believes they probably have the best faculty for the money available in the country, reports his university had to take the twenty-eighth man on the list in filling a vacancy in one of the sciences. This involuntary weakening of staff may well become serious, particularly in the schools with less to offer, as the market becomes more and more favorable to the professor. It certainly should not be further complicated by voluntary (though possibly unconscious) efforts which would make the employing officials content with anything less than the best available.

Most of the discussion in this chapter has centered around the appointment of junior and inexperienced or relatively inexperienced staff. Where the universities turn to more mature and experienced persons for appointments, the procedures are similar except for the differences which have been noted. The qualifications required are very much the same as those which are important in decisions relating to the granting of promotions and indefinite tenure. Because these qualifications are discussed in great detail in Chapter III they have not been presented at this point.

There is another aspect of the problem of acquiring staff which has not been discussed in this chapter. A professor not only has to be invited to come to a university, but he must accept the invitation if the position is to be filled. Thus, it is necessary to inquire into what factors bring the professor to the position as well as those which cause him to be invited. In some cases, as has been reported by Caplow and McGee,[10] the professor departs from his former position and, in reality, merely accepts what appears to be a better opportunity devoid of the disadvantages present in his former post. The writer, however, found relatively little of this sort of motivation as a determinant of willingness to accept the new post. In most cases, the men themselves or those who reported for them seemed to have more positive reasons for accepting the invitation. For the younger men, many times it just seems to be the best or the only offer available. Sometimes the timing makes a difference, that is, the offer comes through first or at a critically important time. Salary conditions the decision, of course, but it certainly is not always the deciding factor.

Much weight is given, particularly by senior men, to what the writer prefers to call conditions of work, which will be discussed in greater detail at another point. Such factors as teaching load; free time; facilities, equipment for, and attitude toward research; library facilities; opportunity for graduate teaching; point of view toward publication; the reputation of the department and of the institution; and many other such factors are considered.

One of the most important factors in securing the mature scholar is tied up with the nature and quality of the staff already in the department and in related areas. As one professor put it, "a weak department regenerates itself as does a strong one." A part of this regeneration comes from the fact that strong men are attracted to and supported by strong men. Thus, one of the most important qualifications of a university which desires to bring mature, gifted and imaginative men to its staff is that it have such persons presently on its faculty and that they be able to testify that their imagination and talents not only are unfettered but are encouraged to bloom.

---

[10] Op. cit., p. 80

A graduate dean in an institution which is working diligently to improve its academic status reports on efforts to secure a top biologist. The candidate visited the university and was completely satisfied with salary, rank, tenure, facilities and other working conditions but asked for a few days to consider the offer. His answer was a refusal, and when he was asked by a personal friend to explain his decision, he simply said, "Here I have a number of outstanding colleagues in my field and in related areas who sustain me intellectually and from whom I secure tremendous stimulation. There I would have few or any such aides to my work and life." A head reporting on the scarcity of talent mentioned a particular university which is seeking two $20,000 men in mathematics. "When you realize how little they have to offer in the way of top level associates for these men you know why they can't find such personnel," he says. "Actually, they'll probably end up with two $10,000 men but will pay them the larger amounts."

Apparently, when the individual concerned is top-level in quality, he is more conditioned by the intellectual setting than by any other single item. He agrees with the dean who summarized the situation by saying that, "Faculty members already present can condition materially the atmosphere in which a new man must work," and with the professor who emphasized, "You must have a strong university, particularly in related areas, to get and keep the best people." This situation poses a real problem for some universities and they are asking, "Where do we get the nucleus of high quality men in the beginning?"

Chapter III

RECOGNIZING PERSONNEL: PROMOTION IN RANK

Official recognition of advancement in higher education is established in three ways - by promotion in rank, by salary increases, and by the granting of indefinite tenure appointments. It can safely be presumed that the goal of every neophyte in the profession is to move as rapidly as possible through the ranks to the full professorship, to establish full tenure rights, and to profit from the salary increases that ordinarily accompany such developments. This goal is dictated not only by a desire for material gain but, with at least equal pressure, by an urge for status and recognition among one's colleagues. Conditions have changed little in this respect since Wilson said "Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the most critical problem confronted in the social organization of any university is the proper evaluation of faculty services, and giving due recognition through the impartial assignment of status."[1]

While the two are not perfectly correlated, and in many cases are administered somewhat independently of each other, there is a distinct relationship between rank and salary. Salary ranges may overlap in considerable degree, but the average as well as the maximum salaries of the associate professors in a given university are higher than those for assistant professors in the same place, and so on through the ranks. Other material advantages come to those in the upper ranks which are not equally available to junior staff members. On the other hand, there is no question but that "rank consciousness" and the association of both rank and salary with status in the profession are quite typical of staff members in all American universities.[2]

A great deal of time and energy on the part of both faculty and administration are devoted annually to the task of deciding which of the staff are to be moved up in the academic hierarchy and as well which of those, who might be qualified in terms of years of service in rank, are to be denied this reward at least for the moment.[3]

---

[1] Logan Wilson, The Academic Man, New York, Oxford University Press, 1942, p. 112.

[2] Logan Wilson presents a detailed analysis of faculty status in his book, The Academic Man. This is one of the best treatments of the subject in the literature. Chapter VII, "Professional Status," and Chapter VIII, "Socio-Economic Status," are most enlightening.

[3] Specific reference to the amount of time involved in one institution is made in Chapter IV, p.49.

The evaluation of readiness for promotion is a serious business in the universities visited and may involve, in addition to one's administrative superiors, his colleagues within the department, a representative group of his peers outside the department, and at times, scholars, beyond the university. Several institutions (or parts of institutions) require an official review of all staff members below the rank of full professor at stated intervals, a few of these on an annual basis. It is not uncommon for a university to require formal reports on those reviewed but denied favorable recommendations, as well as those who have met such scrutiny successfully. The matter of change in rank, certainly above that of assistant professor, is not taken lightly in the state universities.

The institutions visited report a total of 551 promotions effective for the fall of 1958 in the four ranks concerned. Of these, 242 or 44 per cent are within the colleges of liberal arts, and the remainder, 309 or 56 per cent, are made by the professional schools. These and other data are shown on Table 4.

There is considerable variation among the institutions in the proportion of total staff affected by promotions in this one year. The variation as shown in Table 5 is from 3.1 to 14.0 per cent of the total. The institution with the smallest staff promoted the largest proportion, the next in rank order was one of the larger universities, while the third rates as moderate in size when based on total staff. The university with the largest staff ranked seventh in terms of proportion of staff promoted during the year.

For purposes of the ensuing discussion, it is important to note that a total of 551 decisions relating to promotions were made during the preceding year, and that the 11 colleges of liberal arts had to make 242 of this total. At least the quantitative aspects varied among the institutions, since only ten such decisions were made in one place while 125 were completed in another. These data do not include the total number of individuals considered or the number of proposals rejected, which in some cases is considerable, because of the great difficulty in acquiring this information after the actions had been completed. Most of the institutions do not keep central records covering the history of a promotion (or rejection) from the time of its inception. Reported attrition rates of 50 per cent are not uncommon, however, and one department suggested that 70 per cent of its recommendations were rejected the first time they were made. This fact is mentioned simply to demonstrate that the number of promotions approved does not provide a very good index of the time and energy devoted to this task in the universities studied.

The institutions which issue printed statements regarding the qualifications for promotion tend pretty much to agree upon the major

Table 4

PROMOTIONS IN THE FALL OF 1958 DISTRIBUTED AMONG THE ELEVEN UNIVERSITIES

UNIVERSITY		To Assistant Professor			To Associate Professor			To Full Professor			TOT. NO.
		L.A.	Prfs. Sch.	Tot.	L.A.	Prfs.	Tot.	L.A.	Prfs.	Tot.	
I		1	7	8	5	26	31	2	4	6	45
II		12	4	16	19	14	33	19	17	36	85
III		1	1	2	7	8	15	1	3	4	21
IV		6	2	8	12	4	16	6	2	8	32
V		15	18	33	13	29	42	23	27	50	125
VI		8	16	24	10	18	28	7	15	22	74
VII		4	11	15	7	13	20	8	15	23	58
VIII		2	1	3	2	2	4	0	3	3	10
IX		0	0	0	6	4	10	4	1	5	15
X		14	4	18	7	10	17	5	7	12	47
XI		4	3	7	7	11	18	5	9	14	39
TOTALS	No.	67	67	134	95	139	234	80	103	183	551
	%	50	50	100	41	59	100	44	56	100	

Table 5

Proportion of Total Staff Promoted in Various Institutions

Institution	Per Cent of Promoted to Total Staff
I	8.7
II	8.6
III	4.2
IV	3.1
V	9.4
VI	4.9
VII	7.0
VIII	3.5
IX	4.5
X	5.1
XI	14.0

factors which theoretically are considered in evaluating staff. By far the most prominently mentioned are the following qualities:

1. Teaching effectiveness.
2. Research and creative work.
3. Professional competency and activity.
4. Institutional and public service.
5. Personality or personal factors.

The first two, teaching and research, are common to all institutions regardless of size, character, or location. Some of the institutions attempt to group the second and third qualifications under a single heading such as "recognized scholarship," or explain what they mean by research as including a measure of "the quality of publications and other creative work, the range and variety of intellectual interests, participation in professional activities and the ability to develop graduate and professional students in scholarly methods." One institution summarizes the requirements broadly by stating that "superior intellectual attainment, as evidence in teaching, and by scholarship, creative ability, or comparable achievement is, however, an indispensible qualification." Another institution which announces that there must be "clear evidence of scholarship, productivity, teaching ability, personality, character, and service" identifies the important personality qualification as "the ability to work successfully with colleagues and students."

Two other factors are clearly related to promotion, although they usually are not mentioned in the printed specifications and generally are not discussed. The first of these is the factor of time. While ordinarily there is no formal limitation on time in rank before serious consideration is given to promotion, there is a rather definite feeling about such matters which ordinarily conditions the situation, all other things being equal. There seems to be a general understanding of "par for the course," so to speak, and a feeling of happiness or disappointment individually depending upon one's speed of promotion as compared with the norm.

One associate professor for six years says he should "have the professorship within the next year or so." An assistant professor thinks that his four years in rank is enough, but "seniority will also be a factor - a person has to wait his turn." Several persons indicate that they have no question about their status at the moment, but if they do not get a promotion in the next year or so they will be quite concerned. An assistant professor of history said he thinks "at times scholarly achievement is the basis and at other times it's just a matter of time." He thinks six years is required in the assistant professorship. Likewise, administrative officials refer to the fact that a certain indefinite period ordinarily is expected to elapse before a man is considered for advancement.

However, the time factor varies considerably from one part of the campus to another. This variability seems related, at least in part, to competitive salary factors. One of the most significant illustrations of this fact comes from a law dean who suggests a rather attenuated time schedule.

"I like," he said, "to appoint a man for one year as an assistant professor, move him to an associate professorship for two years, then advance him to a professorship as a matter of policy. This is done entirely to get him salary." This kind of time schedule is quite foreign to the humanities or even the social sciences in the colleges of liberal arts. The sciences seem to hold a place somewhere between these two extremes.

Those universities which have a definite salary scale, thereby establish almost inevitably a normal period of service within each of the ranks. In fact, one institution with a somewhat automatic salary scale indicates a normal period in each step within each rank. Thus, an instructor ordinarily spends one year in each of two steps, an assistant professor two years in each of three steps and an associate professor two years in each of three steps. One can only assume, therefore, that the "normal period" for the instructor is two years; and for an assistant or associate professor, six years, before he is promoted to the next succeeding rank, or separated from the institution. It should be pointed out that in the above situation, flexibility is provided by varying both ways from the normal time schedule to meet variations in individual development, but the illustration demonstrates the fact that a salary scale arrangement tends to recognize the time factor as important to promotions. This fact was fully verified in the interviews within this university.

Salary scales, at times, seem to affect the speed of promotion in another way. An assistant professor of history described himself as a victim of such developments in the following manner:

> "I would have been promoted to assistant professor in 1952-53 if the salary schedule had not been increased so that instead of being at the top for instructors I was back $1,000. This delayed my promotion until 1955. Again this past year, I was up to the minimum salary for associate professor, and they changed the schedule again putting me back $500 from the minimum. My colleagues who reached the same point a year earlier got their increases in rank at that time without trouble."

No one in the above institution is opposed to qualitative improvements in the salary scale, but many object to the fact that time involved in rank necessary to reach a point on the salary scale near the minimum for the next higher rank seems to be an important qualification for promotion in this university. In another institution which, while it does not have a formal salary scale, permits no overlap in salary from rank to rank, several persons complain that promotion is occasionally denied because the individual concerned is not sufficiently near the minimum for the next rank to provide the funds necessary to his promotion. Others indicate the reverse - when you get to the minimum salary for the next rank the promotion usually is forthcoming!

The head of a department in this institution said in emphasizing this fact that "When a man gets to a salary level where he must be promoted or get no salary increase, he is recommended for promotion. The floor here has been going up and this affects the speed of promotion as well."

Table 6 summarizes the average ages of the 1,845 professors in the 11 universities at the time they were promoted to full professor. This table does not include those who were appointed originally at the top rank. The average age at which they reached the full professorship is 43.5 years, and strangely enough the liberal arts group, which makes

Table 6

Average Age When Promoted To Full Professor*
(11 Universities)

	Number Professors	Average Age	Range in Average Age Among Schools
All professors	1845	43.5	41-46
Liberal arts	910	43.5	40-48
Engineering	277	43.0	39-48
Business admin.	118	41.6	39-51
Law	68	37.6	36-42
Education	120	45.2	43-48

*Does not include those appointed originally at rank of full professor.

up about half of the total sample, shows exactly the same average age for attainment of this rank.

The law schools show the earliest average age for reaching the professorship, and the schools of education, the latest. In law, as has been mentioned, there is both a tendency to appoint personnel originally at higher rank, and a policy to move men along faster through the ranks. The average in education is no doubt affected by the tendency to appoint more mature men with experience in the field.

The ranges of average ages among the 11 universities also are shown in Table 6 and appear to be what might be expected. Greater details regarding the ages of full professors are shown in Table 10, Appendix, p. 156.

Tables 7, 8, and 9 present the average number of years the present professors in the 11 institutions spent in the various ranks as well as the range in averages among the various universities. These data are shown for all the professors and, as well, for professors distributed among certain schools and colleges. Only 1,040 of the group started their careers in the local institution at the level of instructor. These people averaged 4.5 years in this rank, and the variation among universities in the average years as instructor was from three to six. On the average, the law schools which have few instructors to begin with, keep staff at this level the smallest number of years.

Table 7

Full Professors - Average Term of Years at Rank of Instructor
(11 Universities)

	Number Professors	Average Number Years as Instructor	Range in Averages Among Schools
All professors	1040	4.5	3-6
Liberal arts	524	4.7	2-6
Engineering	181	4.1	1-6
Business admin.	54	4.4	2-6
Law	33	2.5	1-7
Education	54	3.0	2-7

Table 8

Full Professors - Average Term of Years at Rank of Assistant Professor
(11 Universities)

	Number Professors	Average Number Years as Ass't. Professor	Range in Averages Among Schools
All professors	1549	4.9	4-7
Liberal arts	773	4.8	4-8
Engineering	249	5.4	3-10
Business admin.	96	4.0	3-6
Law	53	3.1	2-7
Education	92	5.0	3-9

Table 9

Full Professors - Average Term of Years at Rank of Associate Professor (11 Universities)

	Number Professors	Average Number Years as Assoc. Professor	Range in Averages Among Schools
All professors	1964	5.9	4-7
Liberal arts	953	6.3	5-8
Engineering	304	5.7	4-9
Business admin.	128	5.3	5-18
Law	77	4.0	2-6
Education	127	5.4	4-7

Schools of education are next in this regard and the other units tend to cluster around the average for the total group.

Table 8 indicates that 1,549 persons started in the local institution originally at the rank of assistant professor or instructor. This group served an average of 4.9 years as assistant professor before being promoted. The average for those in liberal arts is practically the same, 4.8. The averages for the professional schools do not vary tremendously from the general situation, except for law, which again shows a real tendency to move men more rapidly through the ranks. The ranges of averages among the 11 institutions in some of the areas, especially some of the professional schools, are rather large, but a study of Table 12, Appendix, p.158, will indicate that in some cases this is due to the heavy influence of one or two institutions in the total.

Table 9 shows the average term of years served at the rank of associate professor by the 1,964 individuals who were appointed originally at this or a lower rank. The average for the total group is 5.9 years, and for the 953 in liberal arts, 6.3 years. With the exception of law, which again is low, with an average of four years, the averages for the professional school groups are quite close to the general trend. As in the earlier data, the wide ranges shown among the eleven institutions, especially in business administration, are unduly influenced by one or two universities, as shown in Table 13, Appendix, p. 159.

It is of interest to analyze the length of time involved in reaching the professorship from the time of original appointment at one of the lower ranks. Before presenting these data, however, it should be pointed out that they are only approximate since the constitution of the groups vary one from the other. We start with those 1,040 professors who were appointed originally as instructors but we pick up along the way another 509 who came first as assistant professors, and finally a group of 415 who were brought to the universities as associate professors. The time factor involved, subject to this limitation, is worthy of some attention.

Thus, if those starting as instructors proceed at the average speed through each of the ranks, the time schedule would be as indicated below.

For all professors	15.3 years
For liberal arts	15.8 years
For engineering	15.2 years
For business admin.	13.7 years
For law	9.6 years
For education	13.4 years

If those who are appointed as (or are promoted to) assistant professors proceed through the ranks at average speed, the schedule of movement would be as shown below.

For all professors	10.8 years
For liberal arts	11.1 years
For engineering	11.1 years
For business admin.	9.3 years
For law	7.1 years
For education	10.4 years

Certainly, if averages can be taken to indicate the general nature of developments, the professor ordinarily serves an adequate period of internship before achieving whatever status and other special privileges accompany the rank of full professor. This situation would appear to be valid for those appointed at either of the two lower ranks. It should be kept in mind, however, that individually there are wide variations in the speed of movement through the academic hierarchy as has been mentioned at other points.[4]

The other rarely mentioned factor related to promotion is competitive offers from other institutions. As competition worsens, this factor becomes more and more apparent. In fact, one dean lists it second only to publications in influence on promotions. One young assistant professor points out that he and his colleagues discuss the "mercantile aspects of outside offers and agree that if you get a recognized offer and they can get along without you, they'll let you go. If they can't they'll give you a raise in rank, or salary, or both. If you don't receive an offer, nothing seems to happen."

---

[4] Further details relating to these matters are included in Tables 11, 12, and 13, Appendix, pp. 157, 158, 159.

An administrator says, "A rise in rank is a device to hold a man against other bids just because we need the staff. Sometimes it isn't his quality so much as the fact that somebody else wants him."

A professor of education points out that his promotion came at the time it did because, "I had a summer session appointment at California and they were afraid this institution was going to offer me a permanent post."

In actual practice, are the five factors listed at the beginning of this section given equal weight in determining promotion, or are some of them more important than others in the practical situation?[5] So far as the personal factor is concerned, it does not seem to operate so much to determine a priori whether a man is to be promoted as it does to serve as a final check once it is determined that he possesses the other qualities desired of a colleague. A great premium is placed on a staff which works well together, where there are no cliques, no schisms, no real trouble-makers. It is clearly believed by the great majority of faculty personnel that the high morale which results from such an atmosphere is most important to academic achievement. A man will not be promoted, so they say, just because he possesses such personal qualities, but he might fail of promotion because of their absence, even though his colleagues are convinced he possesses the other attributes of academic success.

There is little evidence to support the charge sometimes made that personal factors play a major part in determining promotions, or for that matter other advancement such as tenure or merit salary adjustments. To be sure, there is recognition that occasionally personality conflicts, jealousy or other such factors do affect these judgments, but these elements do not seem to play any major part in such decisions among these universities. Only once was the term "vindictiveness" used in connection with the delay of a promotion during the entire period of visitation. There is some evidence to indicate that sometimes unfortunate personal relationships tend to delay promotion, but little to suggest that such matters actually affect seriously the career of the professor in these institutions.

---

[5] L. S. Woodburne's recent treatment of the standards of judgment which should be followed in evaluating readiness for promotion and tenure is worthy of attention. See his Principles of College and University Administration, Stanford University Press, 1958, pp. 76-85.

This is not to say that promotions are not at times facilitated by personal or "political" activity on the part of the candidate, but rather to point out the surprising degree to which these universities seem to avoid such situations. Neither is it to say that individual or collective judgments of one's colleagues or administrative associates do not at times have major influence on one's progress, but rather to emphasize the apparent and sincere efforts to base these judgments on objective approaches to evaluation. The fact that success does not always accompany the effort should not detract from its worthiness. While considerably more critical of the intrusion of the personal element in such decisions, Caplow and McGee concede that "although the scholar's judgment of his colleagues is often blind and biased, and occasionally downright crazy, it _is_ professional."[6]

The head of an English department provided a good summary statement in this area. In talking of staff decisions relating to promotion he said:

> "Personal elements always enter such decisions and with a few they play a sizable part in opinion formation. It is rare, however, that these personal feelings affect decisions. We don't really have 'camps' and this is one of the great advantages of our situation. We want to hold this atmosphere and will go a long way to be sure we don't get a man who is disruptive. If we do get such a man, I would feel justified in letting him go."

It is frequently suggested that the three factors which are important in promotion, (1) teaching ability; (2) research and publication (including professional standing and participation); and (3) service, are a triad and that the man who demonstrates an abundance of one of these qualifications accompanied by a reasonable amount of the other two is the person who will get ahead in the university setting. And certainly, it is said, the man who displays the fine balance which comes from an excellence in all three areas will be promoted and otherwise regarded with greater speed and certainty than his colleagues. The overwhelming weight of evidence collected by the writer gives rise to serious doubts regarding the accuracy of such generalizations.

As one listens to the testimony of faculty and administration in these universities, he becomes convinced that in practice the most important qualification for promotion by all odds is research and publication, or rather research as evaluated by the amount and possibly the quality of publication recorded by the individual.[7] The further up the academic scale, the more important this attribute becomes. Such a generalization is characteristic of those universities which have been, and sometimes still are, primarily teaching institutions, as well as the great research centers. It matters little that the administrative officers and the faculty want to place greater emphasis on teaching or service factors, the fact remains, as they themselves will tell you, that the one element which weights more heavily than all others is production - volume and sometimes quality of production - but always production.

---

[6] _Op_. _cit_., p. 93

An associate professor of botany looking at the situation critically reports:

> "We have been told that we ought to perform well in two of the three areas they list as important, but I don't believe this. I'm a member of the Executive Committee and I believe that without research it's very difficult to get a promotion. Teaching is a pious thought, but in practice other things count."

A graduate dean agrees, and adds a little to the idea when he comments:

> "At times I have said that any interest in teaching on the part of the staff may be said to be fatuous, although this is something of an exaggeration. The major interest undoubtedly is in research. Once in a while they drop someone because he's really a terrible teacher, or move him but this is seldom. Teaching alone certainly won't get you anywhere here."

A professor of journalism believes "one of the problems here has been the excessive pressure on scholarly research to the detriment of teaching." An educational psychologist in another university asserts

---

[7] Practically everyone who examines the situation agrees that such is the case. Wilson (op. cit., p. 219) concludes "Administrators give lip service to teaching excellence, whereas major universities promote staff members primarily on the basis of distinction in research and conspicuousness of publication." Woodburne (Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education, p. 23) asserts that "one further matter that demands attention is whether research publication is to remain almost the only measure of scholarship in a field of learning." Caplow and McGee (op. cit., p. 82) agree that the real strain "arises from the fact that they are, in essence, paid to do one job (teach), whereas the worth of their services is evaluated on the basis of how well they do another (research)." Apparently, neither the time factor nor the choice of institutions studied makes much difference in the appraisal of this practice.

"my own advancement here is due to my research and publication despite the fact I really put teaching first in my own mind." A botanist, in a third school, notes "there is no question but that the heaviest emphasis is to be put on publication and the next heavy emphasis on competition." A philosophy professor volunteers that "If a man is noticeably incompetent as a teacher this bears heavily against him," but a chairman of sociology confesses that "We do everything we can to keep a staff member who is good academically, even if he is a poor teacher. We would try to keep a first-class man even if his teaching is bad," and an associate professor of art concludes, "The earlier promotions, the easier promotions and the higher salaries go to good researchers."

A good deal of the trouble as viewed by both faculty and administration grows out of the great difficulty of measuring teaching effectiveness. The chairman of an English department belives,

> "There's a great deal of lip service to the fact that not enough emphasis is placed on good teaching and too much on publication. The Promotions Committee agrees when pushed that much as they would like to have good teaching and reward it, they can't do it because they don't know how to measure it. For this reason they emphasize publication."

A professor of Spanish, after noting the desire expressed by the administration and the faculty to emphasize teaching, points out, "They're very pious about it, but there's no way to evaluate it." A vice-president agrees, "There's too much emphasis on productivity, but I don't know how to avoid it. You can't get a critical review of teaching. In fact, judging by reports, there are no poor teachers in this university."

The attitude is widespread that because teaching effectiveness is so difficult to evaluate, those responsible for judging merit in practice place primary emphasis on production which can be judged more objectively since one can see and even read the publications or other products of scholarly and creative activity. Thus, productivity is emphasized not only because of the positive belief of many officials that it is the most important element and the one most to be desired, but also for the negative reason that it can be evaluated more readily than another important quality - namely, teaching.

There is a real difference between a frank recognition of productivity as the measure of professional achievement, and the tendency to fall back on such a standard of evaluation simply because it can be treated more objectively, even though another characteristic, in this case quality of teaching effectiveness, is considered to be of equal or greater importance. If quality in teaching really is important, there is absolutely no reason to continue this farce of imponderability which has grown up over the years. Of course, teaching effectiveness is a subjective matter and difficult to measure, but it is impossible to believe that serious efforts directed at the problem would not produce some practical results. Quality of creative effort, generally, and this includes teaching as well as publication, is difficult to judge with accuracy at any time. It seems absurd that the teaching profession (at least on the college and university level), which places such a premium today on research and creative scholarly effort, must at the same time admit it cannot begin to discover some of the truth in an area about which it could be expected generally to be best informed. We do know too little about the effective teacher, but to continue in ignorance with the facilities at our disposal is inexcusable.[8]

Oddly enough, the efforts which have been made to measure teaching effectiveness on a kind of objective basis, tend to center largely around student evaluations. This development may be related to the fact that students are about the only persons traditionally permitted inside the classroom, and consequently, are the only people who can speak as a result of the direct observation of the teaching act.[9]

In one university the provost annually writes each graduating senior asking him to list the five to seven poorest and the five to seven best instructors he has had during his time at the institution. For each of the faculty members who are about to be considered for promotion or tenure he writes 50 to 75 students who have attended this professor's classes, selected at random, and invites them to appraise all their professors of the moment including the person involved. They are provided with a ten-point scale on which to rate the teachers covering the following eight items:

Knowledge of subject
Presentation of material
Enthusiasm for subject
Fairness in marking
Attitude toward students
Sense of humor and proportion
Personal appearance and mannerisms
Over-all summary as a teacher

---

[8] Apparently, time has had little positive effect on this issue. Woodburne, after devoting considerable attention to the problem in an earlier treatise (Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education, pp. 25-35) reports quite recently that "no area of university or college work is more in need of some reasonably objective basis of judgment and decision." (Principles of College and University Administration, p. 50)

[9] There is some reason to believe that the traditional attitude toward visitation of classes is changing. One institution requires deans and department heads to observe and report on their reactions to the teaching of all those not on tenure. In one or two other places, indications are that senior staff members are being encouraged to visit classes and make constructive comments on the teaching of their junior colleagues.

Both sets of judgments are summarized and used with discretion in connection with all kinds of merit ratings.

At another institution, the dean of liberal arts annually writes 100 seniors asking them to appraise their careers and the faculty members with whom they have had instruction. He reports considerable value from the returns.

One university requires student ratings of faculty and makes use of such judgments in the formal evaluations related to promotions and merit salary increases. The ratings are based on an eleven-point scale, and cover six items related to teaching effectiveness as follows:

Attitude toward students
Interest in subject
Knowledge of subject
Presentation of subject
Classroom poise
Intellectual stimulation

Guides are given along the base of the scale to aid the student in making his judgments. For example, for the item "Attitude toward students," the suggestions range from high to low as follows: "Shows a positive interest in and ready friendliness toward students;" "Usually courteous, friendly and agreeable;" and "Frequently disagreeable and overbearing."

Only in a few cases is there any formal suggestion of a rating scale to be applied to teaching effectiveness and used by faculty colleagues or administrative officers, and these are quite restricted in nature. An example from one institution in which the department head and dean are expected to rate the professor on seven items along a five-point scale includes general teaching effectiveness as one of these items. It is defined as follows: "Classroom proficiency; helpfulness to students; professional and general knowledge."

Several institutions regularly give prizes for outstanding teaching performance among faculty members,[10] and one university requests at intervals and gives publicity to reports from departments on teaching innovations which give promise of success.

Actually, there is considerable reason to believe that even in the area of productive scholarship we tend to fall short of qualitative evaluation and to depend too much on the amount of production as a measure of merit. A number of those interviewed touched upon this point.

---

[10] It is interesting that such activities are taking place in institutions where many of the key personnel also insist that there is no satisfactory way to assess teaching effectiveness.

A philosophy professor reports that "The emphasis is heavy on quantity of production and it is growing stronger in this direction," while a young assistant professor of accounting suggests, "They simply count the publications in terms of articles and pages." Several persons have definite conceptions of the number of articles which are expected annually from professors at various ranks, and one man reports a call from a member of a promotions committee asking him if he could indicate offhand the number of pages in a recently published book authored by a neighbor!

That such attitudes affect the nature of a professor's efforts, particularly those young in the academic world, is attested by a professor of Romance language who indicates that,

> "Every year many people publish much that lacks originality. It would be much better in some areas to put two or three years in on a top paper. I know one young man who, instead of doing a solid job turned out five articles in one year. This was less quality than he could produce, but he wanted an assistant professorship and he got it."

A young man in the field of Asiatic studies reports his dilemma: Should he publish his research before it is matured, or should he concentrate on learning the language of the area which will permit him to be more creative in his approach to the culture? The long range course is clear to him. His tentative conclusion: "I can't resist the pressure - I lack the courage not to publish and thus advance in rank - so I'll publish before I'm ready, delay my language study and thus reduce my range of imaginative effort."

One quality seems to characterize the young professor - he is a pretty intelligent person, and, when it comes to an assessment of his future development, rather pragmatic in approach. If they want publication, they will get it, and if they want quantity, they will also get that. Time enough for the more substantial efforts after reaching senior rank. With relatively few exceptions, reports indicate such willingness to adapt to circumstances, at times, of course, with real tinges of conscience of regret.

There is considerable confusion about promotion on most campuses, in part due to the difference between theory and practice discussed above. "Why did I get promoted and my colleague, Mr. X., fail to get it?" is a frequently stated question, according to an associate professor of business. "The criteria do not seem to be uniform," he says. An assistant professor of sociology points out, "There are no clear standards here," and an assistant professor in history confesses, "Sometimes I believe the administrative viewpoint shifts from time to time, and my promotion might be based on any one of three items - scholarship, teaching, r time."

It is impossible to overemphasize the need to clarify and communicate the policies as they exist in practice to all levels of the faculty, particularly to those in the lower ranks who will be more affected by them. As nearly as possible, these statements and the discussions supporting them, should coincide with practice as it can be observed by the junior staff member. This is difficult to do at best, but it is further complicated by the failure to recognize a significant factor in the situation.

This factor was simply but effectively stated by the president of one of the universities when he said, "There must be several routes to promotion or combinations of them." The fact of the matter is that there cannot and should not be a single pathway to advancement even within a given department and certainly within an entire university - "multiversities," someone has called them. The variations in purpose are such as to make such efforts somewhat foolish once a careful analysis is made. A law dean points out that only by varying the bases of promotion can he get the variety of strengths essential to the success of his school. One of his professors is a phenomenon in scholarly production, another a brilliant teacher of the better students, a third noted for his thorough and meticulous teaching in an area which requires such an approach, and a fourth has great strength in working with code developments in the state. He insists that to require these and others to meet a single standard for promotion would be disastrous.

An assistant professor of accounting puts it another way. "They ought to consider a person for promotion," he says, "on the basis of what he was employed to do, rather than have a single standard for all, certainly a standard which changes from time to time." A dean of business administration, who also is asking for flexibility (though not depreciation of quality) in promotion policy, mentions something frequently suggested. He points out that "too much of the standards for promotion and tenure have grown up around the liberal arts college and do not allow sufficiently for differences in other areas."

There appears to be a rather general feeling that the approach to criteria of promotion has evolved pretty much from the liberal arts and that, in many cases, it does not adequately allow for imaginative and scholarly work of equal quality but of different character in other areas. In some cases this might be an apology from those who are consciously or unconsciously attempting to avoid discrimination between real contributions and those which are flabby or low quality in nature. There are others, however, including top ranking scholars in the liberal arts area, who also believe the approach to scholarly contributions has been too myopic and viewed largely through the eyes of the academician in the liberal arts area. These people believe that if journalism, education, engineering, speech, social welfare, the creative arts, and other such areas, are accepted as desirable fields for study and research, it is incumbent upon those responsible for evaluating merit to make their judgments on valid bases which are related to quality in these divisions of content.

At the beginning of this chapter it was mentioned that advancement in higher education comes in three ways: (1) by promotion in rank, (2) by merit salary adjustments, and (3) by the granting of indefinite tenure. This chapter has concerned itself entirely with the first of these methods - that of promotion in rank. The logic of organization has resulted in the placement of salary and tenure treatments in a later chapter, Chapter VI to be exact. However, in these later discussions of salaries and tenure little attention is paid to the criteria of evaluation utilized in reaching determinations of merit, and for good reason.

Actually, the factors which are emphasized in determining qualifications for changes in rank, as well as the problems encountered in such activities are, or should be, identical with those employed to determine merit when the result is to be a salary increase or indefinite tenure rather than advancement in rank. In either case, the problem is to determine whether the individual concerned is sufficiently meritorious to justify a change in status. While most institutions look upon the granting of continuing tenure as of greater importance than a decision to upgrade the rank or increase substantially the salary of an individual faculty member, it is obvious that no university can justify one set of criteria for promotion, another for merit salary increases, and a third for the granting of tenure. In all three cases what is being determined is the quality of the contribution being made (or the potential existing for such contribution) by the individual concerned. For this reason, the reader may assume that the discussion in this chapter, so far as it involves the evaluation of merit, applies equally well to judgments which result in salary adjustments or to the granting of indefinite tenure.

Chapter IV

THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY IN PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES

Within the Department

While it is extremely difficult to generalize because of wide variations within as well as among institutions, it is clear that the intensity and the range of faculty participation in decisions affecting personnel varies directly with the size of the divisional unit under consideration. A faculty member, generally speaking, is likely to have more to say about personnel matters within his department, somewhat less to say about those outside his department but in his college, and least to say about those affecting the university as a whole. This seems to be the situation regardless of the size of the university and without consideration of the general level of participation which characterizes the university as a whole.

Participation in university affairs can be established at three levels of intensity as follows:

1. The communication of valid information regarding developments and plans for the future;
2. Consultation in advance of decision making and during the process; and
3. Participation in the actual decision.

This investigator was surprised at the degree to which faculty members participate at all three levels in those decisions which affect the personnel of the department to which they are attached. While, as has been suggested, great variation exists, the preponderence of practice, particularly in the colleges of liberal arts, is in the direction of involving faculty widely and intensively in such decisions.

This condition, in part, grows out of the fact that the department, by and large, occupies a key position in the organizational pattern and the power structure of the university. Basically, in the college of liberal arts, the department not only is the smallest unit in the organizational structure but carries great authority and responsibility regarding personnel matters. In practically every university visited, the department has great autonomy.

In addition, there is a tendency (in some cases considerably more than a tendency) to share departmental authority and responsibility in varying degrees between the chairman or head on the one hand, and the staff on the other. In a case or two such authority, if not always the accompanying responsibility, has been transferred almost completely to the department faculty or a segment of it.

Participation varies all the way from informal and sporadic consultation to situations in which the faculty, or a portion of it, makes the personnel decisions and directs the chairman to proceed in a particular manner.

Two of the larger institutions visited represent the extreme in formal faculty participation within the department on a university-wide basis. One bases participation at the department level around an oligarchy of full professors. The dean of liberal arts describes its functions as follows:

> "The budget authority in a department is the Budget Council which is composed of all the full professors in the department. It recommends all appointments of instructor or above; all promotions; all salary advances, except for themselves, and all tenure proposals."

The head of the department serves as chairman of the council which does not include associate or assistant professors in membership. The council sometimes consults with the younger men in the department but not very often. The recommendations of the council are those which go forward to the dean although an opportunity is provided for the chairman to indicate his disagreement with the group whenever such variation exists, and he is expected to do so. Here, therefore, with some exceptions, faculty participation at the departmental level is official and formalized, but is limited largely to full professors.

In the second institution, which undoubtedly provides officially for greater faculty participation at all levels than any of the others, there is variation in the method, but for the most part widespread participation at the departmental level in all personnel decisions. The dean of liberal arts in this university indicates that "all personnel actions arise in departments, primarily through their democratic faculty councils." In discussing the implementation of this policy within his department, one chairman says:

> "We have a democratic system in physics. All full professors are on the Budget Committee. The Committee agrees on needs, initiates inquiries and makes recommendations to the chairman on appointments, promotions and merit salary adjustments. The chairman does the mechanical work."

In art, the department works through an executive committee made up of all tenure members. In statistics, the chairman reports that "the department as a whole must act on personnel decisions." The same condition prevails in philosophy. One of the chairmen in engineering reported another variation as follows:

> "The chairman takes the initiative. The faculty takes a large share in the personnel decisions. The chairman, for example, gets a slate of names together, they are reduced to a small group by a senior committee of the faculty and then presented to the department. The chairman must have support of the faculty."

In the law school at this same university, a recruitment committee compiles a preferred list of candidates, and reports to an open faculty meeting. Merit salary adjustments are sometimes discussed in faculty meetings, and sometimes left to the dean. The dean recommends on promotions after discussions with the promotions committee composed of three senior staff men.

A third large institution, which gives considerable autonomy to the departments as well as to the schools and colleges, shows similar variety both in the extent and the method of faculty participation. The degree of departmental autonomy is suggested by one of the top administrators when he states, "The department will get the men they want if they have done a careful job of searching."

In liberal arts at this university, the departments have executive committees which work with the chairmen in personnel matters. A professor of English summarizes such operations pretty well:

> "Legally, (he says) the Executive Committee is only advisory. In English, it is composed one-half of full professors, the rest from other ranks. It is bad to have only full professors on the Committee. Some departments have no Executive Committee or the chairman pays no attention to them. Most of this, however, is gone."

In engineering at this institution, the chairmen take primary responsibility for personnel action. In some areas the faculty votes on appointments and promotions but not in others. The dean suggests, "If the chairman is smart, he will lean on his senior people, of course." In law, the dean tends pretty much to make the decisions unilaterally, consulting only informally and haphazardly with staff members.

In education at the same university, the writer was encouraged by a staff member to, "Be sure to keep in mind the peer perception policy which works both on appointments and promotions." Appointments, he went on to say, are initiated by the head professor in the area concerned (they don't have formal departments), and these are reviewed by the executive committee of the school before candidates are invited to the campus. They visit with many staff members but particularly with the full professors. On promotions, "You first must get on a promotion list made up by your peers." The full professors ballot on these lists and forward their recommendations to the executive committee and the dean.

The most involved plan for departmental participation in personnel decisions is that operated by the college of education in one of the smaller universities visited. The faculty participates heavily in all decisions but it is in the area of rank and merit salary increases that they have developed the most complicated pattern of participation. The committee, which consists of the dean, the three division heads, the faculty member in education who is on the president's advisory committee and three elected faculty, rates every staff member annually on 14 factors or competencies. They total such ratings, determine numerically the difference in the ratings over the preceding year, and allot merit salary increases in terms of the difference figures in tenths of points! They also use the ratings to determine whether to recommend the man for a promotion. While the faculty seems well satisfied with the program it appears to the writer that it involves considerable time and effort in an attempt to over-objectify and over-quantify what basically are non-quantitative judgments. It is interesting that one of the administrators judged the system to be working well because "each year our ratings for most every person turn out to be practically the same as our subjective judgments told us they should be in the beginning."

A psychology professor in one of the large universities reports that his department has a constitution defining the role of the faculty and providing for considerable participation in all personnel decisions. An assistant professor of mathematics says that his department is "democratic according to rank and this is O.K. by me." A number of departments and schools report either personnel or executive committees which play a considerable role in personnel decisions.

The writer does not wish to suggest that all departments provide for participation of the nature outlined above. Even within the colleges of liberal arts in those institutions which generally afford broad participation, there is variation, at times even in violation of by-laws or policies laid down by the board of trustees or the top administration. As was indicated earlier, variations are extreme within institutions as well as among institutions.

There is some difference in the degree to which faculty members participate in the various types of personnel activities. In general, there is wider involvement in the various aspects of appointment than in decisions affecting promotion, tenure or merit salary adjustments. On promotions, many times the entire staff above the level being considered (or a committee selected from such staff) will review the dossiers of their junior colleagues and recommend on their promotions. Thus, a committee of professors (or all of them) will review the associate professors; the associate professors or those in the upper two ranks will consider the assistant professors, and so on. Sometimes an executive or a personnel committee will consider promotions or salary adjustments with the head or chairman. Occasionally, promotions are the prerogative of the chairman alone, who consults only informally with staff; and frequently, the executive officer of the department is responsible unilaterally for recommendations involving adjustments in salary. Sometimes the chairman handles the merit salary questions or even promotions at the expressed request of his staff. Thus, the faculty ordinarily is involved more widely and more intensively in appointments than in either promotions or salary changes. The involvement in salary adjustments is less wide and intense than in either of the other types of decisions.

It would be possible to rank the 11 universities along a scale in terms of faculty participation at the departmental level, but even in the two or three institutions ranking at the lower end of the scale, there would be considerable participation of an informal nature at this level of operations. It is difficult and ordinarily unwise to bring in a staff member against the wishes of the faculty in that department, and promotions under such circumstances are not ordinarily urged by the chairman. Some departments continue to be operated without much regard for faculty opinion although, as was indicated, the number is quite small. The difference among departments seems to be in the degree and the relative formality of such participation rather than in its presence or absence.

On a College Basis

As has been indicated and could be expected, participation of faculty is less intense and widespread at the school or college level than in departmental activities, but there is a considerable degree of it even at this stage. There also exists here great variation from university to university and among units of the same institution.

Since, as has been mentioned, the colleges of liberal arts uniformly have more definitely-developed departmental organization than most other divisions, it is easier to use these more complicated organizational structures to illustrate developments in faculty participation outside the department, but still not university-wide in scope. Reference will be made occasionally to other divisions as the analysis is continued, but for the most part the weight of evidence will be supported through references to the liberal arts areas. As has been stated, many of the smaller professional schools operate much like departments and, thus, are really more appropriately treated in the earlier section of this chapter.

The 11 universities are somewhat unevenly divided on the basis of formal provision for faculty participation on a college-wide basis, with seven schools having no such mechanisms and the other four reporting various types of machinery for this activity. It is interesting that the smaller units tend not to have such arrangements on the college level. This omission is also characteristic, however, of one of the larger and more extreme universities in terms of its general provision for faculty participation. In this latter institution, participation is concentrated around the department on one hand, and on the other, within the total faculty, thus giving some index to the location of power and responsibility. It should also be pointed out that two or three of the institutions, in addition to the four which provide for operating committees, have advisory committees to the dean of liberal arts which consult with him on policy matters including personnel.

The formal arrangements in the liberal arts colleges of the four institutions are outlined briefly below:

> Institution A: An Advisory Committee to the Dean on Promotion and Tenure. It is composed of six people balanced among the three main divisions who serve each for three-year terms. The committee must include one woman and one who is not a full professor. They review specific recommendations involving promotion and tenure and advise the dean on each case.
>
> Institution B: An Executive Committee. It is composed of the dean as chairman and six members appointed by the board on recommendation of the president. They serve three years and assist the dean in carrying out the executive functions of the college, including acting on matters related to budget, promotions and appointments. Departmental recommendations are forwarded to the "the dean and the executive committee."
>
> Institution C: A Faculty Personnel Committee. It is composed of the dean, associate dean and four elected faculty members. (Actually, four are appointed by the dean from eight elected by the faculty.) They make recommendations to the dean and president on appointments, promotions and merit salary adjustments.
>
> Institution D: An Arts and Sciences Advisory Committee. It is composed of the dean, the graduate dean, the dean of the general college and the chairmen of the three major divisions (humanities, social studies, sciences). They review major appointments and all promotions.

As can be seen, the committees vary in method of origin, composition and somewhat in function, but uniformly are designed to provide an opportunity for representatives of the faculty of the college as a whole to review the departmental recommendations and to indicate to the proper authorities or agencies their agreement or disagreement with such proposals. Uniformly, the groups exercise major responsibility and the deans are inclined to take their recommendations seriously. The committees themselves devote considerable time and effort to their work and the testimony collected generally tends to support their objectivity and serious intent. In some cases, the committee has the responsibility of raising a question with the department regarding the lack of a recommendation on some man they believe to be deserving and ready for promotion. In some cases, it is possible for the individual faculty member to appeal directly to the committee relative to his own status. Legally the committees are advisory in nature, but they exercise great responsibility and their recommendations are reversed very infrequently.

On a University Basis

It is most interesting that six of the 11 universities provide formally for more or less systematic review of personnel recommendations by representatives of the teaching faculty on a university-wide basis. These arrangements vary from one of the smaller institutions, in which the president is only beginning to refer policies, principles and occasional specific cases to his advisory committee, to very involved arrangements for systematic and detailed individual review of appointments, promotions and salary adjustments in one of the larger universities.

Three of the six universities mentioned above, two relatively large and one quite small, have formal machinery providing for comprehensive review of at least those cases involving promotion and tenure.

Institution A: The dean of faculties committee, which is secret, is appointed by the dean and consists of approximately 15 members of the faculty. The dean makes it clear that the committee, which meets with him and his associate dean, is advisory, but the writer gained the impression that most of the time the dean follows the recommendations of this committee. He certainly hesitates to approve a recommendation rejected by the committee. The committee has no relationship to appointments or salary, but wields great influence in the areas of tenure and promotion. The group may initiate inquiries when it is believed that a man who is deserving is not recommended, and it will also receive recommendations directly from a professor regarding his own advancement. The dean of liberal arts in this institution indicates that the committee sustains the recommendations from his college (which also has a reviewing committee) about 90 per cent of the time, but other divisions of the university do not fare so well.

Institution B: In the second and much smaller university, general faculty participation is provided through the faculty committee advisory to the president composed of one representative from each school or college (two from liberal arts) selected by the general faculty for the purpose of reviewing recommendations on tenure, promotion and dismissals. The deans of the various units join the committee as cases from their areas are being considered. The president routes all matters relating to promotion or tenure through this committee, which has available for study the annual reports on individual faculty achievement along with student evaluations of their teaching. The committee meets for a solid day, or day and a half in the spring to consider such proposals. The president reports categorically that he never goes contrary to the recommendations of this committee, and says they are right at least 75 per cent of the time. He believes he is justified in giving them full support, even though they do make a few mistakes, because of the constructive contribution they make in raising and balancing standards among various units of the university. Actually, it is not necessary for the committee to turn down more than two or three proposals annually.

Institution C: By far the most extensive and complicated machinery for the participation of faculty on a university-wide basis is that in operation at one of the larger universities known as the senate committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations, composed of five faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate. Its chairman states the committee's largest single responsibility "has been its study of nominations for appointment, promotion and salary increase for faculty members, and of appraisals of those in non-tenure ranks."

The committee depends heavily upon the reports of secret ad hoc committees of the faculty nominated by the committee and appointed by the administration to review individual departmental appraisals and proposals for appointment and promotion. In one year more than half (497) of the university's professorial staff served on one or more such review committees. One man served on seven of them. During this year a total of 247 such committees were appointed to recommend on 86 proposed appointments, 33 changes from "irregular" to "regular" status, 96 proposed promotions, and 32 proposals for indefinite tenure.

The ad hoc committee reports back a definite recommendation to its parent committee on the individual case to which it was assigned. The sub-committee has the benefit of all the supporting data supplied by the department which made the original recommendation, but frequently requests additional data including, many times, reactions from scholars in the same field as that of the man under consideration but outside the university.

The recommendation of the ad hoc committee is not always accepted by the budget committee. The chairman of the parent committee estimates that they go along in about 75 per cent of the cases, they are divided on the sub-committee's recommendation about 10-15 per cent of the time, and about 10-15 per cent of the time they disagree with the committee report. In the end, he estimates, the budget committee reverses or modifies a maximum of 20 per cent of the recommendations coming to it from the departments through their respective deans. He also estimates that the budget committee is supported by the top administration in about 95 per cent of the cases.

The time and energy consumed in the above process is tremendous. One man estimates that each ad hoc committee devotes five hours of meeting time to each case. For the year reported above, this would mean a total of 6,175 man-hours of sessions. The budget committee meets 15 hours per week over a 30-week period which adds another 2,250 hours to the total. Chairmen and former chairmen of the budget committee agree that they do little else during the year they assume this responsibility, and even membership on the committee means giving up a major aspect of one's academic activity for the three-year period of service. However, they agree pretty generally that the results obtained justify the sacrifices entailed.

In this institution the chief executive could very easily find himself faced with four recommendations on a single case varying among themselves in some degree and eventually requiring resolution: One from the department, one from the dean, one from the ad hoc committee, and finally one from the budget committee. No wonder, in practice the dean of liberal arts is requested to study the three other sets of recommendations before filing his own!

Attitudes Toward Participation On a Departmental Basis

Just a little acquaintance with this area convinces the investigator that it is overflowing with dilemmas, frustrations, and contradictions. As several put it, a faculty member approaches the problem of participation in university government pretty generally on a non-objective basis, conditioned considerably by his own peculiar motivations, goals, and personal drives. The operation of such factors makes it quite difficult to discuss the area with any great sense of satisfaction.

In the first place, there is almost a paranoic compulsion to think in extremes. A department, college or university is operated on either a completely democratic or a fully autocratic basis. The faculty must make decisions or the administration will make them. Either there is real concern for the faculty viewpoint or the institution gives no thought to the points of view, attitudes, or feelings of the faculty. The University must be dominated by the administration or by the faculty. There is nothing in between - no continuum along which, conceivably, one might measure the degree or extent of cooperative activity connected with the decision-making process.

Time after time, in discussing weaknesses which appear through faculty participation, the interviewee would exclaim, "But anything is better than domination by an autocratic department head, dean, or president." This either/or complex in part, at least, grows out of a distrust or even a fear of administrators, and a conviction that the only safe way to live with them is to see that they are properly contained. One man gives evidence of this attidude when he says with tongue in cheek, "An honest Dean is the noblest and rarest work of God." Under such circumstances, it is not surprising to find faculties in effect creating a group of "amateur" administrators in the guise of committee chairmen who can be distinguished from their more "professional" colleagues only in terms of their greater power and their relative inexperience in the field. In fact, many of those, who hold formal titles indicating that they are administrative officials, have been selected only after they have served apprenticeship on such committees - a sort of honorary chairmanship of the board where one may live out his academic life unhampered by opportunity to make decisions which by now he is prepared wisely to do!

A professor of economics is distressed because "It is difficult to get across the idea that the administrator is a necessary evil. The administrator needs to concentrate on the purpose of the university, to emphasize the fact that the university is run for the faculty and not for the managers." Possibly, both the professor and the administration need a seminar on the place of a state university in American society.

Another professor, recognizing the tendency toward extremism, suggests that "many of the liberal arts people create an administrative straw man with regard to faculty participation and the need for it." A professor of chemistry touches on another aspect of the problem when he says, "There is a dilemma here. The faculty wants leadership from the administration, but they don't want interference."

A graduate dean, in discussing the problem, suggests the need for a cooperative approach involving faculty participation along with administrative leadership. "Where departments demand an ultra-democratic approach to problems," he says, "they don't make the progress we might like. On the other extreme, where there is a very autocratic head, things are equally disastrous to the department." He apparently would favor an approach similar to that which a former president of one of the universities visited called "government by consensus."

At the department level, for the most part the issue is resolved. The question, excluding rare exceptions, is no longer whether faculty will participate but how and in what manner, as was indicated earlier.

There are places which take a rather extreme position against faculty participation, but these are few in number. A dean of a professional school, in no uncertain terms, announced that "For the faculty in this school to participate in appointments, promotions, and salary adjustments at this time would be a catastrophe. The faculty has absolutely no voice." The time factor assumes some importance when in this situation, however, as the dean points out that now one department has been strengthened, the senior professors will be consulted informally on some decisions. While such is not the case, one might guess that this school is the academic home of a professor who said regarding his part in departmental affairs, "Sometimes I feel I have been hired to make voices in a room." The division mentioned is located in a university which does not excessively encourage faculty participation, but the other administrators are less extreme in their views.

Quite a number seem to prefer that participation by faculty fall short of decision making. An English professor says he wants "a strong chairman who really consults and listens, but who is the decision maker." A professional school dean says their ideal is a chairman who will take the responsibility but who will lean heavily on his senior staff. The head of a large department would divide the decision-making between the department's executive committee and the chairman. He suggests, "There is great strength in good, healthy, logical and well-defended departmental recommendations with real participation by the Executive Committee of the department and the College."

More people favor a somewhat greater limitation on the authority of the chairman exercised unilaterally, however. A departmental chairman suggests that just once has he had to make a decision and then only because of a division in the department. Even in this case the collective judgment of the staff supported his decision after the fact. Another chairman suggests that both the chairman and the dean should do what the staff wants them to do insofar as the budget permits. A psychiatrist would go all the way. He reports, "At the department level, I have a strong feeling that it should be fully democratic. The chairman should have little power." Many of his colleagues over the country echo this viewpoint.

Much of the participation at the departmental level hinges on rank, as has been indicated. A different approach to an oligarchical plan is that favored by the distinguished head of a science department who reports that he believes it best to build the staff around a nucleus of outstanding men. So far as participation is concerned, "The nucleus staff should really govern the department, keep the others informed, and consult with them. The rotating chairman should always come from this group."

Clearly, participation in departmental personnel matters by faculty of the department is generally assumed not only by the staff but by the chairmen and the administration at all levels as well. The differences in attitude reflect varying beliefs in the degree to which the decision-making activity should be shared, the extent to which varying levels of faculty personnel should be involved, and the extent to which such participation should be handled on a formal as contrasted with an informal basis.[1]

Attitudes Toward Participation On a College or University Basis

In the institutions where such practices exist, the majority of the faculty, though by no means all of them, favor a serious faculty review of personnel decisions both at the college and the all-university level. However, in those institutions which have strong reviewing committees both at the college and the university levels, the support of the college committee, particularly in liberal arts, is stronger than for the general university committee. This support is given even by those who recognize certain innate weaknesses in the committee system.

"I'm very much in favor of the Budget Council and the *ad hoc* committee system" says a professor of physics. "The machinery is cumbersome but it will not break down." "The intent is to speed up the process when necessary," states a liberal arts chairman, "but it doesn't always work. This is the price we pay for faculty advice and participation." One of the deans in this same institution makes the most comprehensive view of this position, however.

The Dean points out that some people disagree with the system on the following basis:

1. It is time consuming.
2. Departments feel they know more about their areas than people on the outside.
3. Some don't like to spend so much time in committees.
4. It is slow moving.

After reviewing these weaknesses, he concludes, "I feel strongly the faculty has a responsibility for conditions under which they work and under which they staff. I would put up with much inefficiency to keep the system."[2]

---

[1] The variety of attitudes held by faculty and administration in this area support the suggestion made by Ralph Fuchs that "probably our principle problem is to work out the areas in which there should be delegation to the faculty and the methods whereby such delegation can be made to yield satisfactory performance." "Nature and Sources of Faculty-Administration Tensions, Comments," *Faculty-Administration Relationships*, American Council on Education, 1958, p. 23.

[2] Caplow and McGee take a dim view of such committee activity. They report that "the presence of a university committee in the hiring process is likely to impede the already complex procedures, sometimes to the point of breakdown." (*Op. cit.* 119). And again later, "the more complicated procedures do not produce more satisfactory results." (*Op. cit.*, p. 130)

At another university, an associate professor indicates that "the faculty approve the President's Advisory Committee because they feel it gives them a voice. The deans don't like it (this is only partially correct) but it gives a balance in standards." Generally, where central participation is provided, those who favor it do so for the reasons which have been mentioned. "The advisory committee to the chancellor," summarizes one professor, "gives the general faculty a last bite at the apple before the recommendation passes through the Chancellor's hands."

The opinion is pretty well divided in those universities which do not afford formal review machinery on the college or university level as to whether or not they would want it. So far as personnel decisions are concerned, there is a great deal more interest in participation at the department level, somewhat less at the college level and still less at the university level in these institutions.

The objections to a review of personnel action at the university level are just as strong and vigorous as are the favorable attitudes expressed by those supporting such practices. A department chairman says, "I feel incompetent to evaluate people outside my field. The review committees are a complete waste of time for this reason. They rely heavily on evaluations from outside but if a man in my field is any good at all he can find five people who like his work." He suggests the present system be replaced by regular evaluations of the departments by outside committees.

An economist indicates he is not bothered so much by the time such reviews consume as he is by the fact "that they won't take calculated risks at the tenure level." He says reviewing committees tend to be too conservative. (Another professor in this same university agrees the reviewing committees are "definitely conservative but when we have a high quality faculty it's a good time to be conservative.") A professional school dean says, "I don't like the system. Too many people who know nothing of a man or his department have to pass on him. Outside checks are sometimes a joke."

One of the most interesting comments regarding the most involved system of participation on a university basis, comes from the head of a department in a professional school who, after stating his belief that such reviewing committees should be clearly advisory in function, outlines the following steps necessary to secure approval of an appointment:

1. Getting the position in the budget.
2. Getting a slate of candidates.
3. Review and approval by a departmental committee.
4. Review and approval by a college committee.
5. Review by a secret _ad hoc_ committee which varies depending on makeup, some being ignorant of the case.
6. Provision of more data to the _ad hoc_ committee.

7. Report of ad hoc committee to budget committee
8. Approval or disapproval of ad hoc report by budget committee.
9. Review by chancellor and recommendation.
10. Review by president and recommendation.
11. Approval by board.

He says this procedure means "nothing but frustration for all. It creates an unbearable burden." He suggests the institution substitute a post-operative review every three or five years since departments change only by decades rather than by years.[3]

A dean of engineering is opposed to all types of general faculty review because "he has seen such a system in operation elsewhere and after the expenditure of much time and energy they always arrive at the lowest common denominator in their decisions." A geologist points out that frequently "physics people, for example, are quite negative toward geological research, and thus it would be bad to have a physics man reviewing the case of a geologist up for promotion."

Finally, a psychologist who is fully committed to faculty participation at the departmental level comments, "The university is not a democracy, the senate shouldn't have power. The administration at the higher levels should administer. You can operate a small, homogenous group like a department democratically, but you can't do it in a large heterogeneous body."

General Attitudes Toward Participation

What is it the faculty is seeking when it urges greater opportunity for participation on the university level? In the first place, there seems to be general agreement that the intense desire for participation, is limited to a relatively small group. "A minority of the faculty are really excited about participation in decision making," says a professor of physics. "Many responsible faculty members would be happy with a smaller part, but there is a feeling of genuine concern for the academic problem." An English professor reports, "The talk about participation in total university affairs, in large measure, is just talk. Many are delighted just to be left alone to do their own job. They cry if they're on too many committees and they cry if they're not on any."

---

[3] This dean probably would agree with Logan Wilson when he suggests that "If one were seeking an analogy to academic processes of government in some colleges and universities, perhaps the nearest thing would be a perpetual debating society. Such goings on are enjoyed thoroughly by academic 'windbags' and parliamentarians, of course, but they are extremely frustrating to the majority who would prefer to move ahead with the real business of higher education." "Nature and Sources of Faculty-Administration Tension, A President's Perspective," op. cit., American Council on Education, p. 10.

The faculties of the liberal arts colleges within the universities are likely to be the centers of activity pointing toward greater participation. The staffs of such colleges are presently more active in decision making, their involvements are greater in committee work, and it is in such groups that agitation for more participation in general university affairs is most likely to center. To use the words of one president, "They look upon themselves as defenders of the faith so-to-speak." Very frequently both administrators and staff members of professional faculties indicate considerably less interest on the part of their colleagues in participation at the university level. Usually, such comments are concluded by some such statement as, "Our people are not so keenly interested in affairs outside their area as are the people in liberal arts."

Where such general participation is urged, apparently what is desired is involvement in matters of consequence at a time when something can be done about the problem. "What I would like in the way of participation," says a botanist, "is that important matters of an academic nature be brought before the faculty before they are a *fait accompli* and at a stage where meaningful contributions can be made by the faculty." A historian echoes this viewpoint and says, "The faculty wants a larger share in determining such things as size of the university, the development of off-campus units, reorientation of the campus, the nature of the work of the Academic Senate, - this type of thing." There is considerable feeling that where participation is taking place on a university-wide basis, it tends to deal too much with routine and unimportant matters. Particularly, there is a general feeling that the university senates or other such representative faculty units are pretty sterile operations.

The dean of liberal arts in one of the larger universities says in his institution,

> "They make decisions only after great, detailed committee activity; there is a semblance of participation, but it's not real. There is much dissatisfaction with the present modes and this is quite correct.
>
> "In their anxiety to involve the faculty, the administration involves them at the wrong time or incorrectly. Much of their work is clerical or administrative in nature. Much of it involves a lack of staff support. Committees come because they don't trust the boss."

It must be pointed out, however, that so far as personnel decisions are concerned, and this is the subject of the present report, where general university participation is encouraged, it is quite potent (though not always positive) in its effects.

There is considerable evidence that the faculty if properly informed and consulted would not insist upon full partnership in the decision-making process at the university level. The historian mentioned earlier believes the faculty "really want to be informed and to counsel at the right time and also want an explanation of the decision. If they could have this, I believe actual participation in the decision itself wouldn't be too important."

Poor communication is considered to be one of the most aggravating problems. "Part of the demand for greater part in government," says an English professor, "is a lack of understanding through faulty communication." A man in education is certain that "Communication would answer some of the difficulties. Sometimes the reaction is one of surprise because they don't know what has been going on." He believes, however, that faculty must participate in such general affairs even though communication is excellent because, "You can't appreciate something unless you are working at it, and you can't understand it unless you study it." This problem of poor communications is generally recognized. Petry[4] points out that "Under the best of conditions the communication between faculty and administration is seldom adequate." Caplow and McGee[5] discuss six information screens "which either prevent the dissemination of information entirely or so distort it in passage that it becomes thoroughly unreliable." The problem is not only vertical but horizontal as well. The efforts at informing faculty colleagues from department to department and among schools, seem to have little more success than those involving communication between the various levels of administration and the faculty.

This chapter will be closed with a rather lengthy quotation from a law professor who has given substantial and objective consideration to the problem of faculty participation. His thoughtful statement seems, at the same time, to summarize opinion somewhat and also to point up some of the issues that might well be pursued to greater depths of analysis.

---

[4] Loren C. Petry, "Nature and Sources of Faculty-Administration Tension, A Faculty View," _op_. _cit_., American Council on Education, p. 16.

[5] _Op_. _cit_., p. 59.

"I am not at all clear as to what a faculty man wants when he demands participation in university activities. Usually the demand occurs around some small item and is not really indicative of the problem. .... The size of the university makes it more difficult and the unrest greater. The larger an institution the less concern there seems to be for policy-making on the faculty level, and thus the central administration tends to do a great deal more of it. It varies a lot with the administrator, of course.

"Each faculty member thinks he is outstanding, therefore he ought to make some of the decisions that go with being a superior person. Probably they wouldn't want to take this burden if they had it, but at least this seems to underlie psychologically a good deal of their thinking. You probably couldn't run an institution this size that way, but at any rate this is what I think they want.

"Another factor haunts me. There's not quite the same dissatisfaction with decision-making on the part of those who are well paid. Much of the demand, therefore, reflects a man's dissatisfaction with his own advancement.

"There must be a technique or an art by which the administrator can get across an atmosphere which indicates that he wants to get faculty opinion and wants to help the faculty in their progress. Everybody tries to rationalize the importance of his job when he gets to be an administrator, then thinks if the job is important he must be important, and tends to aggrandize his situation. How to reduce this factor in the large university is one of the big problems."

Chapter V

THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR IN PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES

I. The Role of the Department Head

Since the department[1] occupies such a central role in personnel decisions, the head or chairman of the department must be and is recognized as one of the key officials in developing and administering staff. This is one matter upon which there is rather complete agreement among faculty and administration including department heads themselves.

The departmental chairman occupies a unique position among his colleagues. He sits rather uneasily at times on that narrow no man's land between "the administration" on one hand, and "the faculty" on the other. His faculty colleagues expect him to understand and represent aggressively their points of view and needs, while his administrative superiors assume he will understand and interpret their program to the staff, and administer the department in accordance with such institution-wide policies. The faculty think of him as one of their group, while the administration classify him with themselves. The American Association of University Professors look upon him as a professor, while the deans and presidents call him to meet as part of their administrative boards. This difference in viewpoint probably accounts in large measure for the tendency among administrators to favor a continuing if not permanent headship, while the teaching faculty more frequently prefers a rotating chairmanship.

The fact of the matter is that the department executive is neither administrator nor teaching faculty member and, at the same time, he is both, if such an anomaly is possible. The great majority of all department heads do teach, and in many cases almost a full-time load. He is, then, part-time teaching member of the faculty, and as such continues to live day-to-day with the problems, challenges, frustrations, and rewards of the teacher. In addition, many of them - far more than the majority - continue to do research and to publish, although here they face frustration more frequently than their teaching colleagues due to their tripartite existence. And finally, no matter what the definition of the office may be, whether he is chairman or head, temporary or long term, highly circumscribed in authority or not, he is in reality a part-time administrator with assigned duties, authority, and responsibilities.

---

[1] The reader should remember that for the institutions included in this review, the deans of small colleges or schools within the university assume many of the responsibilities of department heads or chairmen in the colleges of liberal arts.

In fact, the only tenable approach to the department headship is to think of it as two posts, one administrative and one teaching, to use the generic terms. The department head must be able to put on two hats, and it is to be hoped that all concerned, including himself, will recognize the chapeau he is wearing at any given moment.[2] In fact, there is considerable evidence to indicate the difficulties involved in maintaining this dual status. One chairman, while assuming his problems in preserving the balance, reports, "I want to be a member of the team but this works both ways. I have a foot in each camp and have trouble keeping each of them there." Another department executive indicates the same frustration in saying, "I want to join the University but also am loyal to the department; what is needed is a partnership both ways."

Appointments of chairmen usually are approved by the board of the institution and are recommended by the chief executive. Ordinarily, however, the president's part in the matter is largely perfunctory. The dean is usually the key officer in such appointments and his recommendation is the critical one. The dean ordinarily consults with the department faculty, or at least the senior members, and sometimes is required to do so. Ordinarily, chairmen are not appointed contrary to the wishes of the faculty involved, although occasionally appointments are made without consultation or even against the wishes of the staff, most frequently when serious efforts are under way to up-grade the department or where serious splits exist within the department staff. There is a wide range of difference in the degree and the form of consultation in connection with such appointments, varying from an informal, individual approach to formal vote-taking.

Chairmen are usually selected from among the full professors, although this is not uniformly the case. There is no standard practice on salary, though the tendency seems to be to pay nothing extra for the responsibility in an official manner at least. In one institution, it was reported chairmen are supposed to get $500 extra, though the $500 is not eliminated from the salary when the man is rotated out of the post.

The terms of chairmen vary from three to five-year rotating arrangements on the one extreme, to more or less continuing appointments on the other. Actually, the office carries no official tenure, and it is custom or tradition which provides for what is referred to as the permanent department executive. In most cases such appointments are made annually, but it is understood they will be continuing in nature. Sometimes, where rotating arrangements theoretically are the policy, a chairman may be reappointed for a second or even a third term, thus making the office in fact more nearly permanent than rotating. Some institutions avoid such developments by limiting to two the terms of office.

---

[2] Caplow and McGee call this the "swivel effect" and point out that it tends to cause the chairman to throw responsibility for unpleasant decisions upward. The dean also suffers somewhat from this same "swivel effect," they believe. Op. cit., pp. 195 and 199.

The term of office for chairmen may vary among schools on the same campus. For example, on one university, the heads in liberal arts rotate on a definite term basis, while those in engineering and agriculture are permanent. In effect, this means that the schools or colleges involved may make their own policies in this regard. Sometimes, the policy is such as to allow for variations within departments of the same college within an institution. The colleges of liberal arts follow the practice of rotating chairmen of departments more regularly than do the professional schools.

The advantages and disadvantages of the rotating chairmanship were summarized by a head of mathematics as follows:

Advantages - (1) It doesn't destroy the professor as a scholar.
(2) Mistakes in appointing chairmen can be corrected.

Disadvantages - (1) It takes time to learn the ropes.
(2) There is a lack of continuity and long-term planning.
(3) There is not sufficient talent in small departments to support it.

Here again one notices a tendency to accept no middle ground. Either the department executive is a permanent and autocratic head or he is a temporary, rotating chairman who operates on a democratic basis. Either he holds his position until death or retirement removes him, or he rotates out at the end of a three to five-year period according to plan - this in spite of the fact that reports of removal of "permanent" chairmen are frequent (though sometimes accompanied by some disturbance) on the one hand, and on the other, indications are evident of "rotating" chairmen remaining in office over a long period of time. In fact, some rotating chairmen become permanent in the sense that they remain in office until retirement. Again, a great deal of the difference seems to be in the atmosphere which surrounds the appointment and service of the executive officer.

An effective dean of a professional school, who opposes rotating chairmen, tells how he manages to develop an atmosphere which permits the shifting of administrative officers without much emotional wear and tear or injured pride:

> "To upgrade the faculty," he says, "you must be sure to have a way of moving people out of administration quietly. It's a very hard thing to do and reluctant administrators hate to do it, but it ought to be possible gently to ask administrators to make such moves when it becomes necessary. When I appoint a head I say, 'Now you may find after a few years you are sorry you left your scientific researches and may want to get back more to them. Also, I may find sometime it would be wise for you to return to the professorship. Why don't we plan to talk the situation over at regular intervals to be sure what is best to do?'"

Actually, more recognition should be given to the fact that a chairman, regardless of his term of office, becomes pretty impotent if he loses the confidence and support of his major colleagues in the department. "The success of the chairman," says a head of philosophy, "depends on his ability to lead and the confidence of his colleagues. If they are heartily behind him he can do a great deal." What this man didn't say, but inferred, was that the reverse is true - if he doesn't have their confidence the head can accomplish very little. When such a condition occurs, it's time for a change regardless of the basis of appointment, and it would be better if more administrative officers would display the wisdom to recognize this fact and the courage necessary to do something about it.

The role played by the chairman of the department varies considerably from institution to institution and among departments within institutions, from that of merely serving as chairman of the faculty which not only makes policy but also individual and detailed decisions on personnel, to that of executive head of the unit with full responsibility for the operation and staffing of the department.[3] In other words, there are departments which are administered by chairmen, there are departments which are administered by committees, and there are some which are administered cooperatively.

As one of the top administrators put it, in his university:

> "The department heads in agriculture are virtually rulers. They are appointed each year, of course, but they have real power. The dean gripes occasionally about one of them but says he can't change them because of their power. On the other hand, in the arts college, the chairman is really an office boy and I believe this is what the university plan contemplates. In engineering, they are somewhere between arts and agriculture."

---

[3] "The role of the chairman in the hiring process is an uncertain one. He may be a servant or a tyrant." Caplow and McGee, op. cit., p. 118.

"The chairman is not the academic and spiritual leader of the department - rather he is saddled with details," reports an economist and the chairman of an administrative committee in one of the universities. "We are permanent lame ducks," says a chairman of one of the liberal arts departments. A professor of economics states, "Our chairman is merely a presiding officer." A professor indicates, "The role of the chairman varies greatly - in English it is minimal." This is why the dean of a college in which the chairman plays a rather weak role reports, "The best men say it is a waste of time to be chairman." In many departments, therefore, the chairmen, at best, act as indicated by the head of an English department who says, "I initiate recommendations - the professors decide."

In some cases, the chairman exercises real leadership but divides responsibility formally with his colleagues or a group of them. In one department, "The chairman and his peers make the decisions." "The chairman ought to be strong and have help from his associates," says a professor. "If the chairman wants something and says it's the wish of the full professors in the department, he'll get it if funds are available," states another. In one large liberal arts college, the department head formally shares responsibility with an executive committee and other similar arrangements, formal and informal, exist in other parts of the university.

In some instances, the role of the chairman is a much more responsible one. He initiates appointments, takes major responsibility for recommendations on promotion and tenure, and otherwise administers his department with little formal restraint. "The department head is the key," says one of the provosts,"95 per cent of the appointments originate with him." "Heads are the key," states a graduate dean, "the head must exert real leadership." A professor of English avers, "The department chairman, if forceful, is the key in personnel decisions. If not, the dean is." "The chairman must be in charge," states an associate professor of English. An associate professor of history (who opposes permanent heads) agrees that "the chairman is powerful if for no other reason than that he is the avenue of communication with the dean." An assistant professor of architecture indicates, "If the chairman is against you there is no need to expect promotion." An associate professor of government points out that the departments in his university became great because of "tenacious department heads building and holding on to their departments."

Strangely enough, there is a great deal of agreement that the chairman is a key person in personnel matters regardless of the role he plays in the power structure. In the great majority of cases, if he wills it, he can be most important in personnel decisions. He frequently initiates the search for new men and many times, either alone or with a committee, completes the panel from which the final candidates will be chosen. He usually has wide acquaintance with the field, and this gives him an advantage. Usually he writes for recommendations and compiles the dossiers for the leading candidates.

So far as promotions and tenure recommendations are concerned, as a minimum he usually prepares the letters to the dean and, as has been stated, supports these recommendations before the dean and others. The importance of such representation cannot be over-emphasized as one English professor put it, "Failure to support recommendations adequately is tragic." This backing comes, of course, not only by letter but by word of mouth, a shrug of the shoulder, a lift of the eyebrow, or a pounding on the table.

The department, in most of the universities studied, is autonomous to a considerable degree and not only has the authority to initiate proposals but also to make recommendations to the dean on all kinds of personnel changes. Generally, the chairman is legally charged with forwarding such recommendations and when not he usually shares this responsibility with his faculty or a faculty committee. Even in the one university studied where departmental recommendations must come from the full professors, the chairman is now required to file his own personal recommendations along with those of his colleagues. For the most part the departments get what they want in the way of personnel decisions, if they want them badly and uniformly enough. They might have to wait a time, but generally the decisions, particularly when they involve strong departments recognized as interested in quality, go as the department desires. This means that the chairman can be (and frequently is) one of the most important officials in connection with personnel management, regardless of his official role or status. Many times, under circumstances in which he holds heavy authority and responsibility, he is the key to the strength of the department. It would be possible to name a number of cases in which it is literally true that the quality of a strong department is related directly and largely to the work of its chairman. Many times the chairman and the dean working together are the key to favorable developments, just as at times, strength comes from a fine working relationship between the head and his faculty.[4]

A dean of liberal arts emphasizes the opportunity facing the chairman in his institution. He says:

> "He defines the working conditions under which the individual comes to the campus. This helps determine whether or not they get the people they are looking for. He is the guardian

---

[4] Caplow and McGee believe that "the chairman and the senior staff of the department together constitute the most active level of the hierarchy." Op. cit., p. 186.

of the climate under which they come in. He works with the Executive Committee, but he can set the standards, time the search, and take the initiative."

"Where the power rests depends upon the personality of the dean and the department heads," says a dean, and with considerable wisdom. Much of the leadership at the department level is contingent upon the personal qualities of the chairman. Some executives are able to give superb leadership under conditions where they have little legal base to assume either authority or responsibility. Others have difficulty in directing any part of the program in spite of the fact that they are officially endowed with complete authority. An imaginative and resourceful chairman can and should exert real leadership over the department and, consequently, should exercise a considerable effect over its development and contribution to the university and society. To do this he must retain the confidence and respect of his faculty colleagues and of top administration as well. Regardless of official requirements, he gives careful consideration to the advice of his fellows while at the same time he maintains his own integrity as a responsible leader. He uses help wherever it can be found to assist in decisions regarding personnel, but at no time attempts to avoid the responsibility for leadership which is his.

II. The Role of the Academic Dean

The smaller and less complex schools and colleges such as pharmacy, social work, forestry (and occasionally larger units like education and business administration) are not usually organized in departments, or if such subdivisions are made, they tend not to exercise great autonomy in operations. In such schools, the dean assumes most or all of the authority and responsibility delegated to the department heads in the more complicated organizational structures. He, therefore, becomes the most important personnel official in his school, and so far as staff is concerned, is more responsible for their quality, conditions of work, and general treatment than any other university official. Combining as he does, the authority and opportunities for leadership incorporated in such a combination of responsibilities, he personally has great opportunity to affect the general quality of his division. The details of these responsibilities, obligations, and opportunities can be deduced from a study of the section relating to the role of the department chairman and the one to follow, because, with adaptations for size and complexity, the role of the dean, as dean, is similar in these divisions to that he assumes in the colleges of liberal arts.

The academic deans are appointed by the boards on recommendation of the president or other chief executive officer of the university. They have no tenure as deans, serving theoretically at the will of the president, but ordinarily their appointments tend to be continuing in nature. Practically all of them hold tenure as professors, however. In one of the universities, the deans are appointed for two-year terms with the right (which is exercised) of reappointment indefinitely. One other institution reports it is moving to the practice of rotating deans on a seven-year basis. In the remainder, the dean is assumed to be a permanent administrative officer, subject, of course, to the expressed desires of his superiors. The terms tend to be extended through until retirement.

Faculty participate in varying degree in the search for and appointment of deans. In one major university the deans are selected and nominated to the chief executive by a four-man committee of the university senate. In another large institution, the president and his staff consult quite completely but informally with all staff members concerned, secure their recommendations and reactions, and otherwise advise with them. The selection is made by the president but only after careful consideration of these informal, individual, and group suggestions and recommendations. In a third sizable institution, the president appoints an ad hoc advisory committee to aid in the selection of the dean but also takes an aggressive role in the selection. The president of another major university appoints a committee, but he and his staff play a very small part in the search and, in effect, accept the committee's recommendation.

Another president says he takes the key role in the selection of deans. In a recent appointment he took the initiative from the beginning. He talked with every member of the staff, some of them twice, "but mostly for public relations. I went out and got the man I wanted to do the job." In one of the smaller universities, the president takes the initiative, decides which candidates to bring for interviews, and "usually get the man I feel best fitted to our needs." He consults with staff informally regarding their definition of the qualities desired and needed in a dean, whether to go outside or not, and their suggestions regarding possible candidates. He has no committee to advise him and keeps rather tight control of the situation. This approach characterizes two or three other institutions as well.

Ordinarily, deans are paid a salary beyond that of the top professors, although not always. In one institution, the deans complain that they actually would be better off salary-wise if paid at the level of top full professors translated into twelve months of service. There is considerable range in salaries of deans within some of the universities with a few being below the top levels for full professors, and others being considerably above this point. One or two of the institutions express pride in the fact that deans do not necessarily receive pay beyond that accorded professors and might be considerably exceeded in salary by some of the more distinguished professorial staff. Deans ordinarily are appointed on a twelve-month base, which usually means eleven months with a month of vacation.

The dean plays an important role in all aspects of the personnel activities of the university. Many persons including faculty, department heads, deans, and presidents indicate that he is, in fact, the key individual in faculty personnel. Certainly, he and the department head together exercise tremendous authority and responsibility in this area. The dean's role varies from university to university and within universities depending upon the strength of other personnel officials, the participation of the faculty, his personal makeup, and his definition of the assignment.

Where heavy departmental autonomy and responsibility are coupled with intense and broad participation by the all-university faculty in personnel matters, the college as such, and the dean as its executive head, tend to take less responsibility in this area of operations. On the other hand, there is a general tendency on the part of central administration to desire greater strength and responsibility in the deans, and to encourage their assumption of greater authority than presently carried. These two tendencies tend somewhat to offset one another in some institutions.

Faculty members are divided relative to the role they believe the dean should play in personnel decisions, some believing he should exercise a great deal more responsibility than do others. The great majority would like the dean to assume aggressive leadership and recognize its value, although in many cases they expect him to work in conjunction with or at least after advising with senior staff. In at least one major institution, the majority opinion would put real faculty restraints on the dean's authority and leadership. Few will support the idea of weak deans, but if many of their suggestions were put into operation, this would be the result.

"There ought to be more decisions made at the dean's level," says a professor in business administration. "The dean's role in the School of Social Work is crucial," states another. "The dean is the key in Education," comments a third. A chairman of botany believes, "We should have less democracy at the college level and more strong leadership." Another professor who agrees, says, "The deans refer too much to committees. We lack top leadership."

A professor of economics analyzed the attitudes on his campus in the following manner.

> "There are two concepts of the Dean's role," he says. "One conceives of him as chairman of the faculty, and the other as their leader. In many cases the deans have not furnished leadership and the faculty takes it. Sometimes the faculty doesn't take it either and this is the source of real trouble because no

one is leading. The ideal is strong leadership in the dean with confidence in the faculty."

As was mentioned, the central administrative officers want the deans to exercise real leadership. "Strong deans are very necessary," states a president of one of the large universities. "It is most important that all the deans display, in their unique way, strong positive qualities of leadership and planning," says a second. In the judgment of another executive, "The dean is the key to personnel in this institution." A fourth laments that a great deal of local difficulty is attributable to "the lack of a strong dean of liberal arts." One president in a smaller school envisions "strong deans as the only way in which I personally will be able to extricate myself from an untenable situation regarding personnel decisions."

A chancellor says the deans in his university, as well as the department heads, "must give strong leadership and should be able to do so without getting into trouble with the faculty." Another administrator points out that "when the deans are weak there is too much autonomy and specialization in the departments." With few exceptions, there is little doubt where the central administration stands on this issue. They want strong and responsible deans who, of course, will work with their faculties, but who will exert true leadership in their schools and colleges.

The deans themselves look upon their responsibilities in different ways, but generally agree that they occupy key posts in personnel operations. One of them located in a comprehensive college within a large university defined the role of the dean in general terms:

> "The dean's assignment," he says, "is to help the chairman exercise the important functions assigned to him, to encourage him to be aggressive, to raise questions with him, to help him meet conditions he faces. Whatever he needs, whether it be more salary funds or something else, the dean is in a position to aid him. His position vis-a-vis the dean should be one of mutual stimulation, reinforcement and development of important items."

Another dean says, "The structure here permits all deans and chairmen to be very important - not all of them exploit this opportunity, however." Another points out, "The power is in the dean's office so far as liberal arts is concerned." Another dean, in indicating the degree to which he exercises the veto power, emphasizes his feeling that "my job is to exercise my judgment on personnel matters because of my broader base of information, understanding and experience."

The appointment of department heads is considered by the deans as probably their most important responsibility and opportunity. In a minority of the cases, the dean actually is deprived of this obligation because, in effect, he is expected or required to take the recommendation of the departmental staff. Even under the latter circumstances, however, this appointment is considered to be an important one and the dean does everything he can to encourage a wise choice. Where the chairman is looked upon as a permanent or even long-term appointee, the selection becomes even more important, of course.

The deans generally recognize that a department head must have considerable support in the faculty to operate successfully, and thus, even where such consultation is not required or provided for in formal fashion, they advise with the staff members in the department. Where possible, however, the dean varies from time to time in the degree and extent to which he seeks and depends upon staff judgments. One dean, who has appointed six chairmen in recent years, recounts his varied approach to the task depending upon internal factors:

> "The first appointment was in a science department which has been well managed, was doing well at the graduate level, and had no serious schisms. Here I merely suggested my belief they needed a good researcher from outside. They agreed, found a man, and he was appointed.
>
> "In a second science department the staff was weak and divided. They had no good scholars and wanted to appoint one of their own group. I said, 'No, we must go outside.' They made no effort and no recommendation. I went on the road, found a good man, appointed him and they accepted.
>
> "In a third department, the staff selected six possibilities, I reduced them to three, the head and I selected one and offered him the job. He accepted.
>
> "Finally, in a fourth area we knew we had to go outside. I was disappointed in the fact I had to do it all. I found a man, brought him in, got the department's approval and appointed him."

Of course, the degree to which the dean is concerned with the appointment of a chairman varies with the duties assigned to the post. Where this official serves merely as chairman of the faculty to pass along their recommendations, the appointment is less crucial to the dean than in those instances where the chairman has heavy obligations. Even in the former case, however, an effort is made to find an executive who will take full advantage of his opportunities for leadership and who will take all the responsibility conditions permit. This is indicated by the fact that in two institutions where the faculty formally is given a large share of departmental responsibility, deans indicated they had stepped in under unusual circumstances literally to appoint heads, even though the faculty was not agreed upon such appointments as provided in the by-laws or board regulations.

Uniformly, the deans state that, except in extreme emergency situations, they never initiate appointments of staff since they look upon this task as the responsibility of the department.[5] From this point on the situation varies from dean to dean and from university to university. The dean's part also varies from department to department depending upon individual conditions.

The dean of a large liberal arts college says that "appointments and promotions are treated pro forma if I and my Executive Committee are satisfied with the procedures and the qualitative aspects of the process." Occasionally, they delay decisions, ask questions, and refer back recommendations for further support. "Ordinarily, they are approved as they come to us, however."

Generally, however, the deans and the staffs do review proposals for new appointments, particularly those in the upper three ranks, pretty carefully. They participate in determining the specific conditions under which the search will be made including such factors as salary range and rank, field of concentration, conditions of work, and so on. Sometimes these items are so clearly established that such conferring is not necessary, but it is quite common. The deans also like to become involved informally when the panel of possibilities has been reduced to two or three. At this point, some of them, if they disagree with the ranking of the group, may attempt to condition the evaluation. Most attempt to see any candidates brought to the campus for personal interview and, of course, make their reactions available to the department chairman. In some cases, frequently in the professional schools, the dean in consultation with the candidate details the condition of the offer, and at times, tenders it at the time of the visit. Frequently, the formal offer in writing is made by the dean. Participation of the dean varies, of course, in terms of the level and importance of the position involved. It also varies with his rating of and confidence in the department and its chairman.

Almost always the dean goes along with firm and well-supported recommendations which are within policy and budget limitations. He is much more likely to do this without question for a strong and highly-regarded department than for the others. "I take more direct part in the weaker areas," says one dean. "I interfere considerably with the department when it is in bad shape," says another. A third dean reports he takes aggressive leadership in "moribund" departments.

---

[5] As has been mentioned repeatedly, since many professional school deans also act essentially as department heads, they frequently take a more aggressive approach in recruitment or promotion of faculty.

This same attitude applies as well to matters involving promotion and tenure. Ordinarily such decisions originate in the department and, as one professor puts it, "the dean's role is a negative one," in that his only conditioning effect is that of delay or denial of a recommendation.[6] However, some deans will take the initiative in suggesting to the chairmen that certain individuals be considered for promotion; and most of them, where they consider it advisable, will raise questions about specific personnel where no recommendations have been made. Most deans take a more aggressive part in promotion and tenure decisions than in original appointments to the staff. They play an even greater part in merit salary matters, often reaching such decisions in conference with the department chairmen, and occasionally entirely by themselves.

Many deans do not hesitate to veto recommendations when they are convinced a mistake is being made, but most of them like to avoid such formal denials by preliminary conferences leading to a meeting of the minds. In several cases, where the dean disagrees with the original recommendation, he is required to send both his recommendation and that of the department ahead for consideration by central administration. Ordinarily, a very high percentage of the deans' recommendations, as many as 95 per cent, are approved by the central administration. Here too, there is evidence of variations in degree of approval as well as extent of difficulty encountered, based on two factors which are interrelated: 1) the extent to which the central administration has confidence in the dean and his school or college; and 2) the care with which the case is prepared and the vigor with which it is prosecuted.

In several of the universities, the deans of liberal arts and sometimes other deans as well are aided in personnel decisions by executive or personnel committees including representation from the college faculty. While these committees officially are advisory in nature, the dean depends heavily upon them and usually the committee and the dean reach a consensus on each case. The detailed operation of such committees is discussed at length in Chapter IV, but suffice it to say at this point that they show the same tendency, as do the deans, to accept recommendations coming from departments or from chairmen in which or in whom they have confidence, which are well documented, which are in accord with procedural requirements, and which do not deviate from budgetary or other personnel policy. Committees tend to be a little more conservative in these matters than are the department heads and, thus, the tendency is to slow up promotions and tenure decisions somewhat.

---

[6] Caplow and McGee report that "From the department's point of view, this (approval or disapproval of recommendations) is the dean's major function, and his office is frequently seen as a place where candidates get vetoed out of candidacy." Op. cit., p. 184.

The dean is a most important personnel official in the eyes of his administrative superiors as well as those of his faculty colleagues. He is considered to be a staff officer by the central administration, and an aggressive and persuasive leader of his college by the professors. He is close enough (or should be, they say) to the faculty to participate in personnel decisions and planning on more than a casual basis, but also sits at a place where he can take a broad and less personal view of the needs and desires of the several departments. His interest is college-wide, but he can also understand and encompass the peculiar and specialized needs of the various divisions of the college. In such a position, he is able at best to encourage a wise and balanced development of the departments under his direction, and to secure preferred treatment for them from the central administration. So far as the faculty is concerned, he should do this aggressively but with a minimum of interference in internal department affairs and with a maximum of consultation among his colleagues.

III. The Role of Central Administration

The central administration, for purposes of this report, is assumed to include the chief executive officer and those of his major staff who are involved in faculty personnel policies or decisions. It comprehends, therefore, provosts, vice-presidents and deans of faculties. Some mention also will be made of the role of the graduate dean in this area of activity. It is the intent to present in this section the contribution of those administrative officials whose responsibility is all-university in character.

There is general agreement that the president, including his staff, is the key official in the development of broad policies affecting personnel activities and for the "set" of the university - its atmosphere, so to speak. He is expected to establish the tone of the institution, to make clear by word and deed the degree of excellence to be sought in staff, the general nature of the environment in which the professor works, and the emphasis to be placed on scholarship, independent thought, and imagination. In fact, many think that by playing this role effectively both on and off the campus, the president thereby makes his greatest possible contribution to the university. By setting the general tone, the qualitative intellectual atmosphere he, in effect, has established the general goals for faculty and administration alike. By interpreting the meaning of this environment to the public and indicating what is required to achieve and maintain the proper qualitative level, he has paved the way for the necessary budget required to do the job.

"The chief executive can create a favorable operating climate," says a professor of sociology. "The important thing," states a chemist, "is a combination of faculty democracy and a conscious attempt on the part of top administration to make the faculty feel that things of the mind are important." A geologist believes that "morale comes from a feeling that the institution is progressing - that the administration is bending every effort to push the institution ahead." A history chairman says the thing that keeps the top professor in the face of offers involving much larger salaries is "the feeling the department and the university are on the way up, are moving, are alive and vital. This feeling is due in large measure to the attitude and activities of the president and other top administrators."

The president of one of the smaller universities says he "is trying to influence standards of recruiting, promoting and providing tenure in the process of general upgrading." His problem is how to effect such upgrading "without insinuating myself too much into the picture." The head of another institution is dedicating himself and his staff "wholeheartedly to making this a first class university."

Most faculty members look upon the president primarily as a "facilitator" in the personnel area. It is his responsibility, for example, to secure and assign the funds for salary increases, additional staff, facilities for instruction and research and library additions, all of which are related to the acquisition, retention, or provision of satisfactory working conditions of staff. He is uniformly blamed or praised for providing or failing to provide the proper conditions of work for the faculty or for their general welfare. Some members of the staff, in fact, recognize no other role for the chief executive than that which makes him responsible for the general atmosphere and environment of the place in the broadest possible sense. There is no doubt that the budget power vested in the president gives him considerable opportunity to condition the nature and distribution of the staff. This is what one dean refers to as the "stop and go" responsibility of the institutional head. Central administration, in the way it manages budgeted funds, can materially modify the personnel operations within schools and even within departments. More emphasis can be placed on top-level staff in one area, greater resources can be made available for equipment, more liberal allowances can be established for graduate or research assistants, travel, library requisition, even merit salary increases. While in some institutions, much of this responsibility is delegated to deans or even department heads, this fiscal control remains one of the major opportunities for central administration to condition in a general way the quality and contribution of faculty personnel. Generally, such items as the amount to be requested for additional staff and facilities, funds for research, the amounts for salary increases, and even the general method of their use, while actually the prerogative of the board in an official sense, is determined largely and recommended by the central administration. The part faculty plays in such determinations varies, but usually is small. The president usually advises with his academic deans in advance of such decisions, but the role of central administration in this area is a crucial and predominant one.

Faculty and other administrators alike look to central administration for pronouncements on the general personnel policies for the university and, consequently, the president and his staff must see to it that such policies and principles of operation are developed and promulgated. The policy statements are expected to include the guide lines to the employed in recruitment, appointment, promotion, salary operations, and tenure decisions.

It is also necessary to take responsibility centrally for clarification of procedures to be followed in carrying out personnel operations, and to define clearly the role of various officials including the faculty in such matters. Caplow and McGee found "evidence (that) many people concerned with hiring don't know the precise hiring procedures."[7] They also report that "in many universities the rules are so obscure and diaphanous that power situations are left to resolve themselves according to the aggressiveness of the participants."[8] The writer found much evidence to support these generalizations in the schools included in this study.

The policies, responsibilities, and procedures, as was reported earlier, should be developed in consultation with deans, department heads, and faculty if they are to be intelligently conceived and wisely followed. The responsibility rests with central administration, but the wise administrator will secure all the advice possible through wide-ranging consultation, before the decisions are reached. "A precondition of cooperative behavior is that the psychic ditches between administrative units be not so deeply rutted as to preclude the free passage of ideas, ideals, and personalities," says Darley,[9] and this would appear to be the first place to keep the surface flat and the ditches shallow.

Harold Stoke, in commenting recently on this problem, points to the necessity for the administrator to emphasize due process in all the procedural bases followed in the university. He goes on to say that due process "is something more than an orderly way of doing things; it is the habit of giving an appropriate degree of consideration to the interests of all those who are directly concerned."[10] This sense of due process can only be realized if the central administration has given leadership to, first, the development and, second, the effective promulgation of a design for personnel operations including the principles, the policies, the procedures, and the roles to be followed by all concerned.

---

[7] Op. cit., p. 130.

[8] Op. cit., p. 185.

[9] John G. Darley, "How Does a College or University Build Effective Inter-Departmental and Inter-School Cooperation and Coordination?", Current Issues in Higher Education, Association for Higher Education, NEA, 1954, p. 160.

[10] Harold Stoke, The American College ~~Presidents~~ President, Harper and Brothers, 1959, p. 49.

When attention is turned from policy development and atmosphere building to the operational side, there are great differences not only in the role being played by central administration, but in point of view regarding the nature of the role. Not always are the differences directly related to size of institution or staff. Several illustrations will reinforce this assertion.

The president of one of the largest universities says, "My part is nil except in the major administrative positions. More often than not personnel decisions are fait accompli when they reach my desk. I never search for staff and see no more than six to ten candidates per year when they come to the campus." His academic vice-president reinforces this statement by reporting, "The central administration exercises no real power in connection with personnel decisions - we ought to be concerned but don't have the time." Similarly, the president of another large university reports he rarely interferes in personnel decisions. He does participate in the selection of deans, however, more than the central administration does in the first institution. Also, his vice-president and dean of faculties is more active in personnel matters. The latter reports that the review in his office "is pro forma but not perfunctory." The dean of faculties is more active in the appointment of department chairmen and key professors. He tries to see all tenure appointments as they are interviewed but this is somewhat perfunctory. "It would take a pretty serious deviation from the normal for me to enter in and qualify a proposal," he says. "Ordinarily in weak proposals we try to get them to delay the appointment."

The president of another large institution reports that he has only twice declined recommendations "even though I was tempted to do so at other times." However, he does try to see personally as many as possible of the candidates who come to the campus for interviews, particularly at the senior staff level. He also keeps a secret list of outstanding possibilities in various areas, and suggests such people for consideration at appropriate times. Here, however, the vice-president and dean of faculties, a highly respected university official, exercises considerable responsibility in the area of personnel, and reviews with an advisory committee every recommendation for promotion and tenure as well as those involving major staff appointments. The dean reports, "We tend to approve official recommendations pro forma, but we have many opportunities before the formal recommendation is made to condition it." Here, as is seldom the case, the graduate dean is consulted on important personnel decisions both by the academic deans and by the dean of faculties at a time when his opinion can play a real part in conditioning the decision. Perhaps it also should be mentioned that the central administration plays a more aggressive and important role in the selection of academic deans here than does the similar staff in the first institution mentioned above.

In another large institution, the president is probably the most active in personnel operations of any of the chief executives, even though he has several campuses to administer. He reports, "I try to interview and know all the staff who are up for tenure, and wherever possible to meet new appointees." He plays a much more central role than this, however, because in concert with the provost, the graduate dean, and the academic dean concerned, he reviews in considerable detail each proposed promotion, each recommendation for indefinite tenure, each proposal for merit salary increase in the upper ranks, and recommendations on all important appointments. He does not hesitate to veto recommendations if he is convinced they are unwise, but reports, at times, "I yield when the other three are in strong agreement even if my judgment tells me they are wrong." He reports very few head-on collisions, but there is no doubt but that this top level review is a critical one. A professor, in looking at the practice, says, "The president is 'toppening' the university."

Another approach is illustrated in a fourth large institution where central review on a university-wide basis is most important, but where the review is conducted by a faculty committee as discussed in detail in Chapter IV. The chairman of this reviewing committee reports, "The role of administration is very singularly modified by the participation of the faculty on this basis." While the chief executive gives considerable attention to specific personnel cases in this institution, he operates as he says "under considerable restraint." It is possible that he might be faced with agreement on the part of four separate agencies involved in recommending or reviewing proposed personnel actions, and "it would be pretty difficult to veto such proposals when they have the support of all four groups." Here, the administrative aspect of personnel operations have been given over to faculty committees. The writer is inclined to think of such groups as really part of the central administration because of their decision-making role in appointment, promotion, and salary decisions. In this sense, therefore, this institution is one in which the central administrative group is actually the most important of all the operating agencies dealing with individual personnel decisions.

The medium and smaller institutions also vary considerably in the degree and extent of participation by central administration. In one of the smaller units, the President, who is relatively new, is involved very heavily in personnel decisions at least for the time being. He is finding it necessary to review and approve the recommendations relating to important appointments, promotions and tenure, while, at the same time, attempting to develop his deans to the point where they can assume greater responsibility for review and upgrading of staff. He says, "I am using individual cases in which I play a part which I cannot justify on a long-term basis, as a means of educating the deans to assume a larger and more important place in the qualitative improvement of staff." He hopes eventually to have deans who can take the initiative so that he may concentrate more definitely on policies and plans. In the meantime, he must review every important case in order that the policies he is trying to enunciate can be effected in practice.

In another small school, the president has an advisory committee to review recommendations relating to promotions, tenure, and salary, and uniformly approves their review. Normally, he says, this mechanism changes very few of the original recommendations, but it does involve an analysis of every proposal.

In one of the institutions of moderate size, the president, and the provost, and the academic dean involved, review, item by item, each proposal and react to it. The president says he is usually affected "by the attitudes of the provost and the dean. If they both are dead set against me I let them have their way." This is a critical review and the central administration does not hesitate to turn down recommendations where they feel justified. In a university of similar size, the chief executive and the provost, sometimes with the help of a faculty committee, review major recommendations. The chief executive reports, "Usually we approve pro forma, however, we review them sufficiently and veto enough cases to keep them honest. We might even take the initiative at times." The provost in this institution works informally with the other deans in advance of recommendations and "this usually prevents a head-on collision." The president of another university about the same size exerts his influence informally largely through the deans and, at times, the department heads. He also tries to avoid too many formal reviews of recommendations once they reach his desk officially. He is one of the presidents who takes strong initiative in the selection of deans.

Two or three of the institutions are notable in that the central administration always tries to be in a position to appoint a really outstanding man, regardless of budget limitations within the department. The deans and department heads are encouraged to come up with suggestions regardless of whether funds are available, if the men proposed are really excellent possibilities. "They can always find the necessary funds to bring a really outstanding man," says one dean with regard to the president's office. The president of another school tells his deans, "This is what the salary is and this is the rank provided, but go after good men and if you need more money or higher rank we'll talk of this when you find the kind of man who's worth it." This flexibility of approach is a great aid to upgrading the staff and has a very positive effect on morale. The practice also serves as a stimulus to upgrade all aspects of recruitment, to "raise the sights of the department" as they look for replacements.

Thus we see the president directly and through his staff exerting leadership by clearly establishing an atmosphere, a set, a point of view toward the acquisition, promotion, and retention of staff. Both in terms of what he says and what he does he can establish the general intellectual framework in which personnel operations take place. He can condition the attitude toward scholarship, teaching, service, or any other aspect of the professor's task. He can stand and act for excellence in terms of the general principles, policies, and plans which are developed and enunciated under his leadership. Naturally, much depends upon his ability to find the funds necessary to support the kind of establishment visualized, but basically the first and foremost requirement is that the faculty believe the university stands for quality in staff and rewards imaginative and creative work on all sides. Once the faculty and the other administrative echelons are really convinced that this is the kind of environment and personnel to which top administration is committed, the institution is on the way. This is the essential first element, and it grows out of confidence in and respect for the basic administrative leadership at the top.

Stoke, in discussing the work of the chief executive says, "as an administrator the president's real value is to impart to the management of the entire enterprise, by precept and even more by example, not the techniques but the virtues of good administration."[11] This says better and more concisely than can the writer, what is in his mind as he reviews this important aspect of the problem.

Central administration, further, acts to facilitate the development of the necessary environmental factors which create the setting in which the professor may make an optimum educational contribution. The institutional head determines in large measure the nature of the budget items, related to personnel, to be requested from the legislature and the general nature of their use. He has wide responsibility for determining their general distribution and thus the emphasis at various points. In some cases this authority is delegated to colleges, schools, or departments.

From this point on it is clear that the role of the president varies considerably from institution to institution. In some, he and his staff give little time or attention to specific problems of personnel, although at times they might like to do so. In others, he is one of the decision makers at the top level and not only participates in a review of recommendations, but does not hesitate to veto those with which he firmly disagrees. Sometimes, he sees his role as a temporary one pending the development of more adequate staff, or pending the upgrading of the institution. In some cases, his hands are literally tied because such central review and veto power, in practice, is held by a faculty committee. In other cases, a provost or a dean of faculties assumes this power of central review and censorship and, in effect, acts for the institutional head.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 52.

There is a descernible difference among campuses in the general atmosphere of relationships between the administration on one hand and the faculty on the other. The frequently-mentioned antipathy of faculty for administration is visible in the universities visited, but its intensity varies sharply from place to place. Apparently, most faculty members think of administration at best as "a necessary evil," and many agree in principle with the professor who says, "the best administration is the least administration." However, on some campuses, the antagonism for administration or administrators is quite apparent, while on others the general attitude seems to be almost that of good-natured criticism - enough, as one man says, "to keep them a little on the defensive." The writer is inclined to accept the fact that a certain amount of division between administration and faculty is inevitable, but this difference certainly ought not to be of sufficient strength as to affect seriously the working relationships which are necessary to a satisfactory completion of the task at hand. Essentially, the general goals of administration and faculty are or should be the same. Neither group is the raison d'etre for the university - both must serve as means to these ends, the faculty more directly so than the administration since the latter basically exists to make the work of the former more effective.

In part, the attitude is related to the fact that basically the university is a highly-geared, intellectual environment where heavy premium is placed on independence of thought and a lack of restraints upon the individual. This environment attracts the kind of person who prizes his intellectual freedom, his independence from controls. It is perfectly natural to expect such people to resist the kind of "patterning" that inevitably results from organization of any kind, and to react sharply against direction or restraints imposed from above, no matter how intelligently conceived and applied they may be. It is only when such more or less theoretical or intellectualized attitudes are replaced by more pathological and emotionalized postures toward administration and administrators that a real problem arises. In some cases, it must be admitted, the situation approaches this point.

Those universities which seem to illustrate the most healthful and constructive relationships between faculty and administration are characterized by a difference in the general attitude emanating from the central administration, and the president personally seems directly responsible for its character. In the first place, the administrative officers are available, appear truly interested in faculty welfare, and devote a great deal of time to informal associations with staff at all levels. In what, to the writer, was one of the best examples of such "conditions of availability and interest," the president himself is the leading exponent of the philosophy.[12] A faculty member doesn't need an appointment to see him - he may have to wait, but he'll get in. The president takes advantage of every opportunity to meet and visit with his sizable faculty, to declare his interest in their problems and welfare, and to learn in great detail of their work. One young staff member reacted to this treatment by saying, "I don't know the president very well, but I'm sure of one thing - he's on my side." This president knows more faculty members, and knows more about them, than most of his presidential colleagues. Naturally, it's not by accident that this same attitude and approach is characteristic of the vice-presidents, the deans and other administrative officials. In those institutions where the antagonisms seem more apparent, the president seems more aloof, more withdrawn, less interested in faculty and faculty affairs. This attitude seems to transmit itself to his administrative associates as well.

A part of the problem is the question of time and the way it is utilized. In some cases of poor relationships, the central administration is too much occupied with important activities of management to have any time or energy left for associations with faculty, or the development of an understanding of their interests and problems. In the institutions characterized by the better relationships, on the other hand, the president and his colleagues have the time to devote to informal as well as formal relationships with colleagues. In one institution at least, this is the result of careful planning to free administrators from as much of the management details as possible. The university administration all the way down delegates to subordinate officers as much as possibly can be done wisely on the operating side. In addition, at all levels, administrative officers are urged to get as much competent assistance as they can wisely use, and to free themselves for more important activities which they are expected to administer. The president himself has competent help on all sides; the dean of faculties has a top assistant who handles much of the routine; other deans have as many associates as they can wisely use; and even department heads have associated with them such help as they need. The point here is not just that such assistance is available on all levels, _but that it is used to free top administrators to work intimately with faculty and faculty problems_. Other universities have more imposing and larger administrative establishment without achieving the same results.

---

[12] The writer agrees with Stoke when he says "the most important qualification a college president can bring to his job is a philosophy of education." _Op. cit._, p. 161.

The result of all this emphasis upon "availability" is that there is a greater understanding of the basic goals toward which the university is moving, the fundamental policies under which it is undertaking to achieve these objectives, the machinery and procedures necessary as means to these ends, and the respective roles to be played by various groups and individuals. In other words, communication, both horizontal and vertical, is much better in such institutions than in the others. As a result there is much less friction, not only between faculty and administration, but between various administrators or faculty groups as well. The enterprise moves ahead through the cooperative efforts of all the personnel who, while they remain critical of their colleagues, actually act as though they belong to the organization and have some part in determining its contribution now and in the future. Possibly one professor was right when he said, "The president has to give up power for leadership, and for this he gets the confidence of the faculty." Certainly, the mathematician, who pointed out that "there is a great role for attention and listening" on the part of central administration, was touching on a most important matter.

Chapter VI

PROVIDING PROPER CONDITIONS OF WORK

Earlier, the relationship of promotion and tenure policies and practices to the recruitment and retention of a competent faculty were discussed in some detail. There remains a number of other factors which appear to condition materially the attitude of the professor toward his institution as well as his position. It is the purpose of this chapter to consider these important elements which seem basic to a proper working environment for the staff. Their presence in adequate degree and appropriate combination serves positively to attract and retain high-quality personnel. Their absence, or inadequacies in their management, just as surely discourage good people from coming to the university, lower the morale of those present, and cause many to leave for more adequate environments.

Academic Freedom and Tenure

Academic Freedom

The American Association of University Professors in its 1940 Statement of Principles has this to say about academic freedom:[1]

> "(a) The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
>
> "(b) The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.
>
> "(c) The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations.

---

[1] American Association of University Professors Bulletin, Vol. 43, No. 1 (Spring, 1957), p. 114.

> As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman."[2]

These principles, which were adopted by a number of national professional organizations, have come to be pretty much the bible of higher education in this country so far as academic freedom is concerned. The 1940 Statement, which also deals with tenure, along with a later Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings,[3] serve pretty much as guides to the development of policy in a great many American colleges and universities.[4] Certainly, in the 11 institutions visited by the writer, there is remarkable evidence of the influence of these policies and the general philosophy underlying them.

The Association has provided mimeographed recommendations for institutional regulations on academic freedom and tenure. Several of the universities visited quote fully from these suggestions and from the 1940 Statement in establishing their own board regulations or by-laws relating to such matters. Others have adopted principles and policies which follow the guide lines established in these statements of principle if not their actual language.

In fact, the writer was able to discover little or no trepidation among the people interviewed with regard to this issue. The faculty members believe, and say so in positive terms, that they are free to search for and disseminate the truth within a very wide permissive framework. The writer requested each person with whom he conferred to suggest barriers existing which prevent the acquisition or maintenance of a top faculty - the problems which make it difficult to get or keep the kind of people they would like to have. It is of note that only once, among the hundreds of comments in response to this question, did an individual suggest that academic freedom is a problem in his institution, and then only obliquely. In every institution, staff members volunteered favorable comments regarding the freedom of the professor as defined above. Even in universities which have had occasional trouble with dismissals or oath problems (some of it relatively recent), the present feeling, expressed quite generally, is that of confidence in the situation and in the policies presently operating.

---

[2] Stoke recently has said of academic freedom that "Practically, it is more accurate to describe it as the scope the teacher has to study, teach, and say what he pleases so long as he remains within the limits allowed by the participating institution and the society within which he works." Op. cit., p. 113.

[3] American Association of University Professors Bulletin, Vol. 44, No. 1 (Spring, 1958), pp. 270-274.

[4] For a detailed treatment of the history and status of academic freedom, see R. Hofstadter and W. P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States, Columbia University Press, 1955. The volume covers a study prepared for the American Academic Freedom Project at Columbia University.

The chairman of the committee on privilege and tenure of an institution, which was torn by dissension several years ago, summarized the present situation by saying, "I believe there is real confidence in the Board's policy on academic freedom and tenure. They recently adopted a tenure statement which regularized the situation and defined it more carefully than ever." These sentiments were repeated again and again during the interviews.

The writer's judgment coincides with such generalizations, in terms of the principles of academic freedom which undergird the faculty, the procedures available for handling a situation in which charges are made against a faculty member, and finally, the willingness - fact the determination - of the administration to support such principles and procedures in full degree. There is no reason to assume that the question of academic freedom on the campus is either a deterrent to the acquisition of staff, or an encouragement to the withdrawal of staff in the universities concerned. On the other hand, there is no question but that in at least one of the institutions where the material rewards are not the best, many fine people are attracted to the university and remain there because of the extreme degree of freedom which is traditional in this institution. A professor of law stated the general consensus by pointing out that "the spirit of the University as an unfettered place offsets many disadvantages."

It is true, that occasionally a professor will give an interpretation to academic freedom which, at least to the writer, indicates a tendency to read into the privilege assumptions that never were intended. A few of those interviewed seemed to associate it with faculty participation in university government, for example. Without attempting at this point to argue for or against such participation, it would seem clear that the two are not necessarily intimately related, and certainly are not the same thing. A professor can be completely free in his research and teaching activities and play essentially no part in the government of the institution. On the other hand, a department can be operated entirely on a purely democratic basis and yet the individual professor could be quite restricted in freedom to express his ideas and opinions on the campus.

Trippett refers to this tendency when he says:

> "I do not believe, for example, that we should equate academic freedom with the exclusive right to control the college or university we serve. The role that a faculty plays in university management did not originate in academic freedom. Academic freedom means that the professor must be protected in his teaching and his research from the president, the dean, the board of trustees and the public. It does not mean that he and he alone has the right to say what the character and mission of the university shall be."[5]

As one would expect, there is a tendency, but not a very marked one, to want to overextend the limits of academic freedom. Some people would read into this a good deal more than careful students of the problem would agree is proper or appropriate. This issue is quite well handled by Diekhoff,[6] and the writer wishes to quote rather freely from his statement in an effort at clarification.

After first stating that academic freedom "is the guarantee to the professor that the only academic reasons for which he may lose his job are incompetence or intellectual dishonesty," he points out that, of course, there are also "nonacademic reasons for separation from employment."[7] He points out that

> "Professional effectiveness depends on respect for common mores. Habitual drunkedness, embezzlement, sexual irregularity are not covered by academic freedom. Drunkedness is an excellent example of the difference between opinion and act. During prohibition, as now, it would be reasonable to dismiss a professor for habitual drunkedness. It would not be reasonable to dismiss him for opposition to the Prohibition Amendment. Similarly, conspiracy or other action to overthrow the government by violence is ground for dismissal; belief that capitalism is not the best possible system is not."[8]

Diekhoff goes on to analyze a statement by Buell Gallagher presented before the annual conference of the Association for Higher Education in 1955 in which the latter discusses basis for disqualifying faculty members. He then points out that

---

[5] B. K. Trippet, "The Role of the Faculty in College Administration," A.A.U.P. Bulletin, 43:484-491.

[6] John S. Diekhoff, The Domain of the Faculty in Our Expanding Colleges, Harper & Brothers, 1956.

[7] Ibid., p. 99.

[8] Ibid., footnote, p. 99.

> "the disqualifying things (mentioned by Gallagher) are 'the closed mind,' the 'surrendered judgment,' 'lack of integrity,' and moral irresponsibility. Opinions held honestly but tentatively do not disqualify. The party member who has surrendered his judgment and the hysterical demagogue are barred, not the Marxist or the right-wing Republican."[9]

While the writer does not think the problem is a serious one in the universities visited, there certainly is a continuing need to emphasize the responsibilities as well as the privileges involved in the acceptance of academic freedom. Certainly there remains also the necessity to clarify the extent to which limitations must be placed upon the concept in the working situation - limitations which must neither distort nor destroy the basic principles upon which the concept rests.

Lazarsfeld and Thielens,[10] in their comprehensive study involving 2,400 interviews of social science instructors report considerably more restraint on the professor than was evident in the writer's visitation. At one point they summarize

> "It (the effective scope of a man's world) greatly facilitates the summary of our own findings regarding the permissive social scientist;[11] on the average, his occupational world has a more extended effective scope than that of his conservative colleague. But the difficult years have threatened to restrict this scope. As a matter of fact, as we saw in the last two chapters, this has sometimes already happened: a number of social scientists, for instance, have withdrawn from participation in community activities, and some have confined themselves to a narrower sphere of teaching and research. In these respects, then, the effective scope of higher education in America was threatened."[12]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 101.

[10] Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., The Academic Mind, The Free Press Publishers, Glencoe, Illinois.

[11] The "permissive professors" are defined as those who are "interested in new ideas themselves and tolerant toward other people who hold unorthodox views." Ibid., p. 113.

[12] Ibid., p. 264.

These students become more specific in their negative attitude toward the situation further along in their report when they say:

> "As several respondents remarked, there was a time when colleges were proud of their eccentrics and their outspoken 'characters.' Such appears to be less the case today. The wistful respondent who can still say, 'some of us would like to be leftists' is evidently out in the cold; the teacher who says, 'we all want to be known as innocuous members of the horde,' seems to speak for many."[13]

While this attitude was not entirely absent in the responses obtained by the writer, it must be said that it did not appear in any significant sense. Either the interviewer was particularly inept in uncovering or sensing such a point of view, or the institutions selected were unusual in this respect. The writer is led to hope that the latter explanation is the correct one by another set of conclusions reached by Lazarsfeld and Thielens, which they report as follows:

> "The higher the quality of a college, the larger its proportion of permissive[14] social scientists.
>
> "The higher the quality, the stronger the pressures and attacks from the off-campus community.
>
> "The higher the quality of a school, the better the performance of the administration in defending the academic freedom of its social scientists."[15]

These authors included only four of the institutions in their study which are also among the 11 being reported on presently. Possibly these and the other seven involved are among the higher quality institutions of the country and, thus, are well defended generally against such attacks. Certainly, the faculty people interviewed gave strong evidence to support the view they are not particularly disturbed about the possibility of inroads on academic freedom within their institution. Even in those institutions where there is a tendency to be critical of the central administration on other grounds, or where there have been unfortunate incidents involving academic freedom in the past, the attitude now seems one of full confidence that basic faculty rights will be preserved and defended.

That this element of academic freedom is of the utmost value to the maintenance of a high quality staff and the sustenance of morale cannot be questioned. Such an atmosphere must be preserved as the very heart of the university idea.

---

[13] Ibid., p. 235.

[14] For definition of "permissive social scientists" see footnote 11, p. 85.

[15] Ibid., p. 176.

Indefinite Tenure

Higher education has developed a unique method of rewarding faculty for satisfactory service which is considered by many academic people as one of the great advantages of the profession. This is the practice of placing the staff member on "indefinite tenure," ordinarily after a period of probationary service under one or more term contracts. In effect, when a professor is given indefinite tenure status, he can be dismissed only for "cause."[16]

The American Association of University Professors, an organization which has exerted active leadership in this area, defines the principle as follows:

> "(a) After the expiration of a probationary period teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies."[17]

The Association then proceeds to outline five elements of acceptable practice in applying tenure. These items may be summarized as follows:

1. The precise terms and conditions of appointment should be in writing.
2. The probationary period should not be more than seven years including all full-time service in higher education. Notice of termination should be given at least one year in advance of failure to renew appointment during this period.
3. During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom accorded other staff members.
4. Termination for cause should be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution.
5. Termination for reasons of financial exigencies should be bona fide.

---

[16] One institution lists the following causes: Neglect of duty, physical or mental disability, dishonesty, immorality or conviction of a felony.

[17] Reprint from American Association of University Professors Bulletin, Vol. 43, No. 1 (Spring, 1957), pp. 113-118.

In general, the tendency of the universities visited is to follow the principles of indefinite tenure quoted above as well as the practices suggested by the AAUP. There are two notable exceptions which should be mentioned in the beginning. One institution has no official or formal tenure regulations because the Board governing the institution has no authority to undertake such employment contracts. For this reason, all staff members are appointed officially on a year-to-year basis. This seems to make little difference in the situation actually, as is indicated by a department head who said, "The unofficial nature of tenure has nothing to do with the staff. We have it even though it's not official. We have one year contracts by law, but nobody pays much attention to it after a few years." An associate professor of history points out, "There is no official tenure here, but administrative policy is such as to create a favorable tenure situation." So far as this institution is concerned, they act as though they have tenure even though it is unofficial, informal, and actually unexpressed. There is very little concern about the lack of an official status for tenure.

In the second university, indefinite tenure is available only to full professors. A movement is under way to extend tenure privileges to assistant and associate professors after a probationary period of three years. Top administration is favorable to such a move as is the faculty, but as yet the proposed modification has not been approved. This condition exists in a university where academic freedom is traditionally accepted by all concerned as an essential part of the environment. While they believe tenure privileges should be extended, most of the faculty have no real concern regarding the status of their colleagues who are not on a continuing appointment. In fact, it is a little difficult to determine just what are the conditions of appointment in this institution, and since the faculty have so few complaints about termination of employment, there is little concern for a more definite statement of employment conditions and terms on the part of the staff. One of the senior faculty members in this institution seemed to epitomize the local situation when he stated, "The question here is largely academic. It is said here with reason 'to be fired a man must commit rape on the post office steps at high noon in the midst of public outcry.'"[17] This picturesque statement summarizes pretty well the faculty feeling, at least toward the status of tenure and the sense of security with which most faculty members face the future.

All nine of the remaining institutions limit the probationary period to a maximum of seven years, usually including all experience in higher education. At least one institution theoretically will give tenure at any rank, but the majority limit it to the upper two ranks. There is pressure to make tenure available to assistant professors at least under special circumstances, and one or two institutions have moved in this direction. Where a limit is placed on the probationary period (seven years) and tenure reserved for associate and full professors, the institution has an "up-or-out" policy whether such is recognized officially or not. It is not unusual, under such circumstances, to limit the term at the instructorship to approximately four years and the total for the two ranks to seven years, although one university counts service at the instructor level on a two-for-one basis in arriving at the total. The "up-or-out" policy forces the institution not only to decide on tenure, but also on rank, during the period involved.

---

[17] A recent statement on this subject is Tenure in American Higher Education: Plans, Practices and the Law by Clark Byse and Louis Joughin, Cornell University Press, 1959. There is no overlap in the 80 institutions included in the study and the 11 universities the writer visited.

Some institutions require a probationary period even for associate and full professors although usually of shorter duration than for junior ranks. In others, appointments at the senior levels ordinarily carry with them the privilege of indefinite tenure. Some institutions fall in between with policies which ordinarily require probationary appointments even at the upper levels, but which permit indefinite tenure to be given under special circumstances, usually when this is the only way to get the man they want badly.

There is great variety in the extent to which the institutions take advantage of the full probationary period before deciding on tenure. In some cases the matter is entirely optional with great variations existing between schools and departments, as has been indicated for promotions. In one of the larger universities, on the other hand, the firm policy is to utilize the entire probationary period before reaching a decision. In some cases, rank and tenure are tied together as one decision so that, for example, when it is recommended that the individual be promoted to associate professor this automatically carries with it indefinite tenure. In others, the decisions are made separately.

The decision to grant tenure uniformly is regarded as probably the most important personnel decision made by the university and, consequently, is taken quite seriously in all the institutions. The procedures followed and the qualifications considered necessary coincide pretty much with those for advance in rank, particularly to senior level, and have been discussed in detail in Chapter III.

Attitudes Toward Tenure

Attitudes toward tenure expressed by faculty and administrators vary all the way from definite opposition to full support of the practice. Not only faculty members, but administrative staff as well, range along the scale from one extreme to another. A great many recognize a real dilemma here - on the one hand they place great emphasis upon the desirability of tenure as support for the academic freedom essential to university life, and, on the other, they realize the burden to the university and to society occasioned by incompetent and indolent faculty members protected by the tenure system. Estimates of the number of such personnel vary, but most staff members admit their presence in small numbers at least on every campus. It also is commonly accepted that the removal of such personnel for "cause" is such a difficult and painful process that such action should be avoided at almost any cost.

Some faculty members support the system without qualification, but they are in the minority. "The principle," says a chemist, "is the most important thing in American higher education life." Others take the same unqualified position and are equally definite in their favorable attitudes toward its need and contribution. Another minority group just as definitely opposes the system. An engineer says, "I am unalterably against tenure. A man can't sit back on his knapsack and be any good." An associate professor of zoology is more detailed in his statement of opposition:

> "So far as tenure is concerned, I am opposed to it. It can promote a stagnation which lasts. We tend to be lax in appointments; they get tenure and stay on forever. They are not the kind of people we want. There's no real need for tenure and it's a dangerous thing. At times it protects the individual but this is an exceptional case. I have seen no beneficial effects of tenure, but many of the other kind, since I have been here."

Most of the faculty classify somewhere between these two extremes, in fact are favorable toward the system while recognizing its weaknesses. Some of these have suggestions for improving its operation and others wish they had. A sociologist says cryptically, "Tenure is more good than bad but only slightly so." A former graduate dean philosophizes, "It's just like getting married - once you've made the arrangement, you have to live with it for better or worse." A chairman of chemistry says, "It's a little like a one-way street. It takes care of the professor but not the institution." Another professor thinks it's a "little like the U. S. Senators - what they say on the Senate floor can't be used against them." A professor of social work believes "tenure is important, but absolute tenure is bad." He doesn't offer any solution to the problem, however. A dean of education wants qualified tenure and says, "There's something dead wrong when we freeze in the incompetents." He, too, has no constructive suggestion to offer.

A law dean favors tenure but "tenure doesn't mean much in a good university." A botanist believes that tenure "is a barrier to releasing a man who has stagnated." He does not speak for or against it but recognizes it as a problem. A professor of chemistry feels tenure is quite desirable. "There is a tremendous craving for security," he says. "Men want to know how they are doing and this is an indication. It is purely a psychological factor. The bad thing is it allows a man who deteriorates to stay on and this must be watched."

Some of those who favor tenure want the mechanics of its operation modified. A head of foreign language says, "They don't need seven years to decide on tenure. Four or five should be sufficient." On the other hand, a graduate dean wishes they could give a longer trial period than the six years allowed at present. A dean of engineering would completely separate tenure and promotion and give tenure decisions more intensive study. On the other side of the fence, the head of history in a different university, believes that associate and full professors should have tenure automatically.

About the only constructive suggestions made by those who favor the system, but recognize its weaknesses, involve a tightening up of the process of employment, promotion and granting of tenure. A philosopher, in expressing this attitude says, "My attitude is divided. I like to have it but I think it's bad for some. We probably should be more careful in awarding it." A political scientist sums up the point of view of this group quite well:

> "Tenure," he says, "is a matter of great concern to me. The security philosophy has a large element of potential mediocrity building into it, thus we must be most careful in giving tenure. We must be very careful in the initial hiring and there shouldn't be any regular routine to decide. There needs to be greater ruthlessness in such decisions than we display at the present time."

A number of the younger men, particularly in the more competitive fields indicate little real interest in tenure. They want it as long as it is available, more or less as a badge of academic respectability, but insist that it is not really important to them. Generally, these people feel that if they are not wanted they don't desire to stay, and there are always opportunities elsewhere. Many of them believe the university could "get rid of them" if it wanted to do so even if they were on tenure. Sharply contrasted with this view is that of a young man in a competitive area (and also in the university which has no legal tenure) who wishes tenure were available because if he felt more secure he would be willing to make a major investment in a new home.

Thought provoking to say the least is the statement of an associate professor in an institution which gives indefinite tenure only to full professors. He says:

> "Tenure is no problem here. I don't know the regulations in fact. I think I have tenure (he doesn't) but I'm not sure.

The administration leans over backwards to avoid unjust treatment. Formal tenure would be just a word here so far as I am concerned."

These words support a belief which developed as the writer made his visits to the 11 universities, a belief that is sufficiently supported by the interviews as to be worthy of mention, at least. In these 11 institutions, and possibly in others like them, it could be postulated that there would be very little difference in the management of personnel whether formal tenure regulations existed or not. There would remain the same attitudes of unwillingness to move against the incompetents, the malingerers, the mediocre as at present. The social (and political) pressures against the discharge of long-time employees would continue to be quite strong and effective. The tradition and atmosphere of freedom would operate as a brake against any vindictive or even inhumane action on the part of administration. So far as could be observed, there is no more concern on the part of staff regarding their security in either the institution which gives tenure only to full professors or that which legally cannot give indefinite tenure, than in the others. Certainly, at least one of these would rank near the top of the list in terms of the degree of interest in the welfare and stability of its faculty. It may be that the concern we have for the weaknesses of the tenure system is misdirected and that in reality we are working with weaknesses implicit in the university system as a whole. This belief should not affect the determination to improve the situation, but might help in a redirection of such efforts.

Tenure is probably here to stay. It has become so interwoven with the concept of academic freedom that it would be unwise to attempt a separation even if such were desired. It also is looked upon as one of the rewards of the profession to offset the lack of material gains which usually accrue. A surprising number of academic personnel at all levels, however, recognize weaknesses in the system, and express their concern that efforts be made to rectify the situation. They do not want to eliminate the system, but do want to do away with its weaknesses if possible. The suggestions for modification fall in two categories, both certainly within the realm of possibility. In the first place, the need to be much more careful in the choice of staff is emphasized and particularly in the granting of rank and tenure, as a means of safeguarding the university against incompetency or mediocrity. It is urged that where there are doubts or uncertainities the decision should always be in the negative. This attitude should be taken even in the face of a poor market situation and, if necessary, at the expense of leaving a position vacant for a time.

The second suggestion involves the assumption that the university has some responsibility to insure the success of faculty personnel once such persons are given its stamp of approval. Those who express this viewpoint believe that many times a man deteriorates or becomes ineffective in considerable part because he is not properly motivated, assigned, or utilized. They argue that all concerned, including his colleagues, attempt to aid one facing a circumstance of decay in effectiveness to become rehabilitated, so to speak.

These two suggestions are certainly not contradictory. The first would have us be more careful and discerning in making the original appointments of those who are likely in the course of events to become permanent staff, and to be even more objectively critical in making the important decisions relating to promotion and tenure. This tightening up of selection and promotion, if successful, would make certain that a larger proportion of the staff possess the potential necessary to permanent employment. The second suggestion is directed more definitely at that group which was thought to have (and may have) the qualities necessary to satisfactory performance on a permanent basis, but who for some unexplained reason have failed to live up to their promise. It is urged that every effort be made to encourage and stimulate such personnel to perform at the level to which it was originally assumed they could rise, before a final judgment is reached. Such efforts may involve encouragement, re-assignment, motivation, rewards, supervision - any number of approaches. Of course, mistakes will always be made and people do change. But, it is suggested by many that a vigorous campaign to select personnel on a high qualitative basis, coupled with a personnel program designed to encourage fully the innate capacities and interests of the staff, might go far toward solving the problem.

Salaries

The typical university visited does not have a salary scale in the detailed sense, although a majority of the institutions have minimums for all ranks and several have maximum salaries for each rank but full professor. Two of the universities permit no overlap in salaries between the ranks, but wide overlapping is generally characteristic of the others.

Two of the institutions have rather inflexible salary scales involving regular step increases in each of the ranks. The only flexibility involved is that, on a merit basis, an individual may jump one or more of the steps as he moves ahead. In one case, there is a normal period of retention at a given step interval, and the meritorious person can move out of the level at an abnormally rapid rate. Theoretically, the less capable person can expect to remain at the level a longer period than the normal time involved. This institution also has a plan for "out-of-scale" salaries at the professorial level which extend beyond maximum rates allowed in the schedule by as much as $5,000. The writer was told that about 25 per cent of the professors have salaries out of scale and various departments report as many as 50 per cent of their full professors are in this preferred situation.

In the other institution working on an official schecule, there is no time arrangement connected with each step interval. The scale merely defines the beginning level, the number of steps involved, and the increment associated with each step. The speed with which the individual moves through the steps is affected by (1) his merit, and (2) funds available for salary adjustments. At times, as has been mentioned, promotions in this institution are delayed because a man otherwise qualified is sufficiently below the minimum salary of the next rank that there are insufficient funds to care for the promotion. This is possible because of the large number of steps in the scale for each of the ranks, which range from 10 to 12.

Salaries tend to vary considerably within the university depending upon competition and supply. In areas like pharmacy where the number of men with doctorates is low and competition from industry as well as other universities is keen, the tendency is to start men at higher pay (and rank) than the average. One dean reports starting salaries as high as $7,000 to $7,500 for beginning Ph.D's. In engineering, law, business administration, and education similar situations exist. Here the average and top salaries, as well as the beginning rates, tend to be higher. For example, the top salary in liberal arts at one university is $9,000 while in business administration it is $10,000 and in law, $10,700. In another institution, the maximum salary in liberal arts is reported as $14,000, and in law, $16,800. One law dean reports starting salaries for new men at the rank of assistant or associate professors as ranging from $7,600 to $9,612 which is considerably out of line with other beginning salaries - so much so in fact, that special permission was necessary to institute the practice.

The best index of these variations is provided by a comparison of the averages for professors at the various ranks in the proposed budget of one of the universities. The over-all average suggested for full professors is $9,763, but these averages vary by schools from $11,654 in law, to $7,750 in the literary school. Similar ranges exist in the averages proposed for the various schools in the rank of associate professor, although the range is quite small for assistant professors and instructors.

Likewise, there is a tendency to vary starting salaries and average salaries at the various ranks among departments within the colleges of liberal arts. Thus, in physics and mathematics, for example, it is necessary to pay higher starting salaries for the same training and experience than in English, history or philosophy. This differential tends to be continued throughout the scale because of the competitive market conditions. The differentiation is even greater than it seems, since the men in the preferred areas are also more likely to be used as consultants or to work under contractual arrangements on research projects frequently at additional pay. Reports of such added income vary as high as 50 per cent of the full-time university pay.

Mention has been made of two universities in which relatively inflexible salary scales are in operation. Attention should be called to another institution where the reverse is true and flexibility is generally the rule. Here the schools and colleges have great autonomy in budget management including merit salary funds. Thus, in a sense, salaries are determined on a divisional rather than a university basis in large measure. Extreme cases of variation from the normal are scrutinized centrally and sometimes modified, but generally speaking, salaries vary from area to area in terms of the needs and desires of those areas without regard to a single university pattern. Other institutions have some of this flexibility but not in the extreme fashion displayed here.

One institution, while it has no salary schedule as such, will permit no overlap in salaries from rank to rank. This is creating a considerable amount of difficulty in connection with recruitment of staff.

Salaries vary in the 11 universities from a minimum of $3,600 to approximately $20,000 on a nine-month basis. The lower rates ordinarily are reserved for those instructors who are also working on doctorates. Some indication of salary range is provided by [illegible] minimums paid in one of the universities, where salaries are relatively low in comparison with the others. The minimums (nine months) for each rank are as follows:

Instructor	$4,400
Assistant professor	5,500
Associate professor	6,600
Full professor	7,500

The average full professor is paid in the neighborhood of $8,400 if a number of endowed professorships carrying salaries of $12,750 are excluded.

Another university, which ranks somewhere near the midpoint of the group, pays average salaries (nine months) at the various ranks as follows:

Instructor	$4,489
Assistant professor	6,111
Associate professor	7,372
Professor	9,432

The president reports a range from $3,600 for full-time teachers with rank of instructor who are also working on graduate degrees, to $12,000 for the highest paid professor on a nine-month basis. He hopes to go to $14,000 in the next year.

A university which ranks above the median for the group studied has the following range in its nine-month salary schedule:

Assistant instructor	$4,020 - $ 5,460
Instructor	4,980 - 7,140
Assistant professor	5,940 - 8,930
Associate professor	6,900 - 10,140
Professor	7,980 - 11,940

The president of this institution is hoping to secure approval in 1959 for the inclusion of 15 to 20 "distinguished professorships" to carry salaries of $15,000 - $18,000.

One of the largest institutions which pays salaries that are competitive with most of the universities of the country operates under the following salary scale for the various ranks: (nine months)

Instructor	$ 5,232 - $ 5,638
Assistant professor	6,204 - 7,176
Associate professor	7,920 - 9,612
Professor	10,344 - 12,900

In this university about 25 per cent of all the full professors are off scale and range in pay up to approximately $18,000. Other institutions indicate top salaries for the nine months of $16,000 to $20,000.

With possibly two or three exceptions, salaries in the universities studied compare favorably with the median salaries announced recently for the land-grant colleges and universities and for the separate state universities.[18] All of the schools visited hold membership in one or the other of these two organizations.

Rank	Land Grant Colleges and Universities	Separate State Universities
Instructor	$4,900	$4,750
Assistant professors	6,030	5,870
Associate professors	7,260	7,120
Professors	9,480	9,170

Some of the institutions studied are committed to the use of their entire salary increment funds on a merit basis, and all of them express a desire to use at least a part of the amounts available in this manner.

---

[18] Unpublished memo from W. R. Bokelman, Chief Business Administration Section, Division of Higher Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, Office of Education to R. I. Thackrey, Secretary, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities and to C. P. McCurdy, Jr., Executive Secretary, State Universities Association.

Individual salary increases as high as $2,000 in a single year are reported, and most places where no official salary scale is involved indicate wide ranges in the increments awarded when sufficient funds are available to make such arrangements possible. Ordinarily, when funds for salary adjustments are limited, the tendency is to use most or all of the amount on "across the board" adjustments. The faculty generally was more favorable to the use of salary funds solely on a merit basis than the writer had anticipated.

Salaries have increased materially in recent years, even though in most cases they have failed to match increased living costs. Faculty recognize that administrators have been emphasizing this problem in their efforts before state legislatures. The dean of a professional school, for example, reports he recently reviewed the history of salary adjustments for five men he took on in 1954 and 1955 and found their average dollar increase in pay for this period was 61 per cent, with a range of 57 to 63 per cent. He was commending the president for making such developments possible.[19]

Salaries are never high enough, they start too low, the range is too small, and the maximums are inadequate, if the reactions of administration and faculty can be taken at face value. Of all the factors reported as most closely related to acquisition and retention of staff, this category received the most attention. Regardless of the institution or the salary situation, this intensity of reaction characterizes the responses.

The reactions vary somewhat in terms of the existing salary pattern. In some institutions the problem is that salaries at all levels are just too low, and consequently the starting salaries and the range of salaries are both thought to be inadequate. In other cases, while not completely satisfactory, the starting salaries are reported as less of a problem than those of associate professors or professors. In some institutions, the range, particularly the top end of the scale, is the problem. Most universities report salaries are inadequate to get or keep mature and nationally known scholars. While each institution tends to compare salaries with what it considers to be its competitive universities, none of them can ignore the general situation, particularly for beginners, since all are recruiting from the same pool of talent. Estimates made of the increment necessary to provide a satisfactory situation vary up to 50 per cent of present salary levels. In other words, the problem, from the point of view of the staff, is not one which can be cared for by the usual increments or even those which have been accruing in recent years.[20]

---

[19] The median per cent of salary increase for state universities from 1955-56 to 1956-57 was reported as 5.4 per cent and from 1956-57 to 1957-58 as 10.4 per cent by the Research Division of the National Education Association. "Salaries in Higher Education," N.E.A. Research Bulletin, Vol. 36, No. 3 (October, 1958), p. 95.

The salary range is considered most important in the acquisition and retention of staff. In fact, one institution, which is somewhat handicapped by inflexibility in starting salaries, in recruiting by a rigid salary schedule with no overlapping salaries by ranks, uses the wide range at the top as an offset to this limitation. Administrators suggest the candidate compare both the starting salary and the possible income within a few years or ultimately, before deciding on the place of employment. Most thoughtful people are as much interested in where they can go salary-wise as where they start. Both are important to ambitious and competent faculty members.

Flexibility in salary pattern is an important element so far as faculty are concerned. In the two institutions with rigid salary schedules, this reaction is quite apparent. Curiously, however, the general attitude toward the schedule itself is favorable. "We like to know what we can expect as well as what others are getting," reports one professor. It is a little hard to see how they can keep the rigid schedule under which they are operating and at the same time create a more flexible situation. In one institution which permits no overlap between ranks, the reaction toward this practice is definitely on the negative side.

The attitude toward the practice of permitting variations in salaries in terms of market conditions is more tolerant than expected. In one institution where support of the salary schedule is quite strong, there is relatively little objection to special and favorable salary arrangements for the law school, for example. While this reaction is by no means unanimous, there certainly exists a passive acceptance on the part of many for the practice of paying generally higher salaries in the more competitive professional areas and in the divisions of liberal arts, such as physics, where outside opportunities are plentiful. Neither is there great antagonism to the growing practice of permitting full-time professors to earn as much as 25 to 50 per cent of their normal salaries, in addition to these salaries, either by consulting outside or on contracts with various agencies. "We don't like it exactly," says one man in the humanities, "but we don't know what can be done about it. Maybe they had better develop government contracts for professors of English and history." Apparently the philosophy "go thou and do likewise" is catching on to the extent that it is feasible. There is no question, however, that the salary policies of these institutions are being adapted to recognize a differential in favor of those who are in demand not only by other institutions but by business and industry or government as well. In fact, some administrative officials, while deploring the situation, frankly admit that this seems to be the only feasible method of developing and keeping a staff of high quality in certain areas of effort.

---

[20] Probably most professors are too conservative in estimating the necessity for major salary increases. Beardsley Ruml and Sidney Tickton say, for example, "Salaries paid to the most eminent professors also show drastic deterioration. In 1891, the University of Chicago established a rate of $7,000, probably the highest in the country. Today's equivalent would be $38,300. In 1908, top professorial salaries of $5,000 were not uncommon. Today's equivalent, merely to restore the 1908 status, would be $19,200. Teaching Salaries Then and Now - A 50-Year Comparison With Other Occupations and Industries, The Fund for Advancement of Education, October, 1955, p. 18.

Seymour E. Harris suggests an increase of 50 per cent in the near future and an additional 35 per cent within ten years, or a total of 95 per cent in all. He believes "A rise of these proportions would reestablish pay at near pre-war levels in relation to the rest of the working population." "Faculty Salaries," A.A.U.P. Bulletin, Vol. 43 (December, 1957), pp. 581-93.

But as Caplow and McGee say, "The significance of an academic salary is not adequately measured by how many potatoes it will buy."[21] Salary is one index of status and is so regarded by many professors. Diekhoff puts it well when he points out that "Salary and the standard of living it makes possible stand for more than physical comfort. They mean some command or loss of respect of the community."[22] He continues, "They (the professors) have the vanities of other men and intellectual capacities that might qualify them for other occupations of high prestige, and they know it. They will not be content in a profession low in the hierarchy of community status."[23] There is little doubt but that much of the pressure for salary increases is related to such desires on the part of the faculty. Major increases, however, can be justified entirely on the basis of economic and professional facts.

Teaching Load

The teaching load, measured ordinarily in classroom contact hours, officially varies from 12 to 6 hours among the 11 universities. Five of the universities list 12 hours as the general requirement, three report 9 hours, one indicates three courses as normal, and the other two vary in official instructional assignment from a standard of 9 to 8 hours, respectively, for junior staff to 6 hours for senior staff. As one would guess, there is considerable variation both upward and downward from these standards, and actually in many cases they serve simply as guides to average out the assignment of teaching duties, or to determine the typical load.

---

[21] Op. cit., p. 58.

[22] Op. cit., p. 84.

[23] Op. cit., pp. 84-85.

One of the most interesting reactions in this area is that no matter what the nature of the load may be, the staff thinks it is too high. In each university studied, a heavy teaching load is considered to be one of the barriers to the acquisition or retention of staff. In 9 of the 11 institutions this reaction is quantitatively quite strong. Where the typical load is 12 hours, it ought to be 9; where it is 9 hours, it ought to be 6. In cases where full professors are assigned 6 hours or two courses, this is considered by some to be too heavy.

This reaction is not unrelated to what the professor considers to be important to his professional growth and advancement. Ordinarily, he wants the teaching assignment reduced in order that he may devote a greater proportion of his time to research and writing. This interest stems either from his desire thus to concentrate, or his belief that this is the way to get ahead, or both. It is equally strong, if not more intense, in the younger men, particularly the scientists.

The faculty are equally definite in their belief that the method of evaluating load needs to be modified. Suggestions were made in every institution, but one, that such revisions would aid materially in securing and keeping faculty. In four of the universities this is classified as one of the most important factors in recruitment.

Revisions are suggested in three directions. In the first place, it is felt that the university should include all elements that are officially assigned to the professor in determining his load, not just his classes. If committee work and other service activities are important, credit should be given for these assignments. If emphasis is placed on research and writing, then allowance should be made for these efforts. If extension teaching is critical, such classes should be considered a definite part of the load.

A second proposal suggests some effort at qualitative measurement of the teaching load. How large are the classes? How many preparations are involved? At what level are they taught? Are they new courses? What kind of assistance is provided? These and similar questions must be considered, it is said. How much time is involved in committee assignments, in public appearances, in professional activities? What are the time factors involved in extension teaching off the campus?

In a political science department, new teachers are credited time and a half for each hour of teaching against the teaching load assignment under the assumption that their work requires greater time for preparation than it will at a later date. There are others who believe the beginning teacher should be given consideration of this sort.

All such questions and suggestions are pointed at the fact that it is the load of the teacher, not just the teaching load that must be considered, and that the assignment must be measured qualitatively as well as quantitatively. The common attitude is that, if the university believes something is important and asks a professor to do it, such assignments should be fully considered in estimating load.

The third type of suggestion relates to the administration of the policy regarding teaching load. The most frequent proposal involves the establishment of a standard load, say 12 or 9 hours, with the understanding that actual assignments of class load will vary up or down from this point in terms of other obligations, and as determined at the department level. In fact, some believe that the matter of load can only be handled on a decentralized basis, and that the central administration, after promulgating general policy statements and procedural suggestions, should simply provide a budget and say to the college, school or department, "Here are the funds available for staff; you know the job to be done and the qualitative level at which we expect it to be achieved - go to it."

Under such proposed arrangements, variations in the teaching load would be possible at any given time and from semester to semester for an individual, depending on the nature of his other obligations. If his research or writing or his committee work, for example, is heavy at a given time, his load will be reduced below the normal level - to no teaching at all if conditions justify such action. On the other hand, if his major assignment during a given period is teaching, his load might well be advanced above the standard level. Qualitative conditions such as those mentioned earlier can also be considered in determining the teaching assignment.

Likewise, in assigning teaching duties to various members of the staff, such factors can be evaluated. If the man is involved regularly in a heavy program of research and writing, he will teach fewer hours regularly. If the professor is primarily a teacher, his class load customarily will be heavier than the average. Like adjustments may be made for qualitative factors and the experience of the staff member. This type of personnel management is difficult but it will pay dividends, many believe, and this is what administration means to them.

A part of the problem lies in the fact that the professor who is generally expected to concentrate on instruction and scholarly activities finds it increasingly difficult to do so. To the extent that he is required to take on additional obligations, or to involve himself in activities which are not at the core of his scholarly or instructional duties, to this extent he must neglect his basic assignment.

Except for a few professors who want to limit themselves to a classical definition of their duties, no one believes that a professor can avoid or for that matter should avoid, other obligations of university and professional life. The problem is not that of eliminating other responsibilities, but rather of attempting to reduce such factors to a minimum consonant with his institutional and civic obligations. It might be well to take a look at a few of these distracting factors.

One set of disturbances involves the extent to which the professor is required to assume duties and responsibilities in teaching and research which might better be assigned to others, and which others, for that matter, might perform with greater confidence.

One of the most frequently mentioned weaknesses is that of insufficient or inadequate personnel to assist the professor in his work. Needs for such assistance range from competent secretarial help, to readers, laboratory assistants, graduate assistants, research assistants and technicians. A head of history answers the phone of the department every afternoon because the departmental secretary is half-time. Professors write their own business letters because of inadequate secretarial help. A senior staff member reads all the themes written in her freshman English classes. There is inadequate assistance given professors who instruct large lecture courses.

On the research side, the professor must many times serve as his own technician or construct the equipment he needs for his experimentation. In the humanities, where time is more important than facilities, the need is for top ranking research assistants to work in collaboration with the professor. Many times when help is provided it is inadequate in quality or lacking in experience. There is great emphasis on the need for experienced and capable assistance for research, some of it certainly at the post-doctoral level.

It is suggested that what is needed at this point is a careful analysis of the entire operation in an effort to determine how best to provide facilities and personnel which will permit the professor to concentrate on the functions which he alone is uniquely qualified to pursue. This is not just a desire to avoid menial tasks, in fact many of them are anything but menial, but rather to make it possible for the professor "to go further" as one man put it. Neither is it entirely a matter of emphasizing his status, although such considerations are not absent from these suggestions. Primarily, however, the recommendations grow out of a desire to eliminate those activities which are not essential to his core assignment, or which can be done satisfactorily by others. It is pointed out also that it is poor economy to use a professor as his own secretary, message carrier, technician, or research assistant.

A second set of factors which enter to upset the professor's concentration on instruction and research, are assignments in other areas of activity. Committee work stands at the head of the list. There is nothing which is more characteristic of a university than the fact that it has a faculty or administrative committee, or several, in every area of activity with which it is involved. Many men serve on a dozen or more committees and some of these are quite time-consuming. Uniformly in the universities, this factor is mentioned as a real problem. As would be expected, it is a greater issue in those institutions which emphasize faculty participation, than in the others, though it exists everywhere. In the institutions which involve faculty heavily in university management, the professors, while complaining bitterly of committee work, do not want to discontinue such assignments since to do so they believe would eliminate them, in some degree at least, from control of their own environment.

Recommendations to modify work on committees take two directions: (1) a reduction in the number of committees, and (2) a reduction in time spent in committee activities. Many feel that committee meetings are poorly planned and poorly managed. There is need for more adequate staff work in preparing for the meetings and in organizing the data for discussion. Some suggest that the time spent in committees could be cut by 50 to 60 per cent if such agencies were managed more effectively.

Faculty members object to time spent on advising students, particularly that part which is concerned with the routine of schedule building. There is much objection to the "red tape" required in purchasing or requisitioning supplies and equipment, and in employing and reporting on secretarial and other non-professional personnel. While it is true that college teachers seem to have a distaste for routine, this reaction is much more than a response to rote activities. It is a negative response to time spent in routine management which the professor believes might be handled otherwise or elsewhere, and which if eliminated from his obligation would permit him to concentrate more on teaching and/or research.

For practical as well as theoretical reasons, some such program as that indicated earlier is essential if students are to be taught by regular and important staff members. Pressures to reduce teaching load are such that before long, unless they are resisted, the funds necessary to support the staff required under such circumstances will just not be available.[24] It is also obvious that the numbers of qualified professional personnel necessary to accept the assignment under such circumstances are also not going to be available in the near future. It certainly makes little sense to those who know the situation and the great variations in the abilities, interests, and competencies of senior staff members in such institutions to suggest, as one professor did, a standard load for all full professors of one course every other semester. Some professors might well be employed as research scholars and thus devote all or a major proportion of their time to such activities and teach very little or not at all. On the other hand, those professors who want to devote their efforts largely to instruction and who do it well, might well teach more than the normal load. The majority of the staff, in such institutions as those studied in this program, will vary somewhere between these extremes and will fluctuate in teaching assignment depending on other important responsibilities as well as the ebb and flow of other activities.

---

[24] Caplow and McGee call attention to the fact that "the average teaching load has been falling precipitously in all the major universities in recent years." Op. cit., p. 145.

Many share the feeling expressed by one academic dean who said that unless some such qualitative system of evaluation as that suggested earlier is to be used, it will be necessary to develop a sort of semi-professional, second-rate staff to carry the instructional assignment in such institutions. He insists that it is time to declare again the fact that teaching is an important part of university activity, and that instruction ordinarily should be recognized as one of the characteristics by which a professor is identified.

Retirement

Compulsory retirement ages for faculty range from a low of 65 (four institutions) to a high of 70 (five institutions) with one university operating on a 67 and one on a 68-year retirement program.[25] One of the institutions retiring faculty at 70, gives a final year of leave with pay and, thus, effectively retires professors at age 69. Two institutions permit faculty to continue beyond retirement age under special circumstances and arrangements, and practically all institutions permit earlier retirement for cause.

Three of the universities or university systems operate their own retirement programs, three are affiliated with The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, and the remaining five participate either in state employees or state teachers retirement programs. It is interesting to note that none of the institutions in the middle part of the country are found in the latter group.

---

[25] Button found in a survey of 42 state universities, the fall of 1956, that 52 per cent retire at 70 and 15 per cent at 65. D. E. Button, "Retirement Practices of State Universities," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 43 (September, 1957), pp. 492-97) Woodburne says, "The average age of retirement in colleges and universities varies only between sixty-five and seventy." (Principles of College and University Administration, p. 58)

Basically, the universities seem to be attempting to develop programs which will pay the retired professor approximately one-half of his average salary during the final years of service, sometimes including Social Security payments. To operate on a basis superior to this standard. In one of these, the retirement income apart from Social Security payments equals 2.17 per cent of the salary for the best three years, times the years of service. Under this plan, a man with 30 year's experience will receive better than 65 per cent of his salary in retirement. The second institution has a program which is similar but the years of service are multiplied by 2.00 rather than 2.17 per cent.

On the other hand, three of the institutions have quite poor programs in this regard and provide a very low rate of income to the retired faculty member. In one of these, the maximum is not over $2,500, including Social Security; in one, the Board guarantees a minimum of $2,000, plus Social Security; and in the third, the maximum will go very little beyond this base at the present moment.

very little beyond this base at the present moment.

Only one of the universities operates a non-contributory program and this one funds its own retirement. The others require contributions from the staff member varying from 2 per cent of the first $3,600 in salary to 9 per cent of the total income. In the TIAA institutions, two universities contribute on a two-for-one and the other on a 50-50 basis.[26]

Judging by the comments of the faculty, staff members are less concerned about conditions of retirement than is generally assumed. In four of the 11 universities there was no mention of retirement as one of the factors which contribute to the development and retention of an adequate staff and no suggestions of needed improvements in the local system. In the other institutions, the comments were neither as numerous nor as intense as had been expected. A great many faculty members are poorly informed about the details of the retirement provisions in their own institution, and quite a few just don't seem enough interested to make inquiry.

In those institutions which have quite inadequate programs, however, the reaction is strong. Here the staff pretty generally agree that the defective retirement arrangements retard the acquisition of staff, particularly in the middle-aged brackets, and certainly make it easier for some professors to be lured away by other offers. On the contrary, the liberal retirement arrangements in several of the universities serve as deterrents to the erosion of staff, particularly where a professor cannot take all of the accumulated reserves with him.

---

[26] For a comprehensive review of retirement programs, see William C. Greenough, College Retirement and Insurance Plans, Columbia University Press, 1948.

This lack of ability in some cases to transfer sums accumulated through contributions of the institution, is one of the frequent criticisms of programs involving this element of restriction. This practice is characteristic of the state-operated programs but not of those involving arrangements with outside organizations such as the TIAA. In fact, there is a great deal of feeling against any kind of retirement program which legislates against mobility of the professor.

A few suggest that the institution carry a larger proportion or all of the contribution to retirement as one method of providing the professor with delayed real income. Others urge that universities develop a program planned to aid the professor in anticipating retirement, not only financially but socially and psychologically as well. The universities are uniformly neglectful of this responsibility for some unidentified reason. Others suggest more definite planning to give the retired professor a feeling of "belonging" after retirement. Here, again, the institutions do very little beyond giving formal emeritus status, continuing such persons ex officio as staff members and, occasionally, providing minimum office space. There is relatively little thought or attention given to men in retirement in these universities with a few notable exceptions.

[illegible] little beyond giving formal emeritus

Other Factors

The inadequacy of travel funds for faculty is the source of a good deal of irritation, and many suggest that it is a factor in maintaining morale, and even in retaining staff. Generally speaking, to the extent funds are available, they are spent to provide a portion of the expenses of those professors who are invited to be on the annual program of their national professional organizations. Because funds are so limited, ordinarily it is not possible to pay more than transportation costs to such meetings. This practice leads to curious arrangements among colleagues to meet the criterion of participation, but it is no good anyway. The professors point out that it is important to meet one's colleagues regularly and personally, that they must be visible to be known and this is as good for the university as it is for the professor, and that attendance at national meetings is a way of getting recognition, meeting prospective staff, and learning about new developments in the field. Most believe full expenses to one meeting annually should be the minimum allocation.

Greater liberality in granting leaves of absence with pay or partial pay is considered quite important. Some of the universities do not have sabbatical leaves and others limit them to staff already on tenure. Quite a number suggest a considerable extension in leaves or grants for summer research activities. This, they say, would make it possible for the professor to remain at home, to use the familiar setting of the university, and to do work in which he is intensely interested. Now, they say, it is necessary at best to take an assignment away from home involving something less central in the way of research, and at worst to secure employment which has no direct relationship to one's professional interests. Some universities are developing programs of grants for research to be done either on or off the campus during the academic year and/or the summer months, and such experiments have the full support of staff.

Other factors which are mentioned as important to the morale of staff and thus to their retention are adequate faculty housing, at least for a temporary period; adequate free or inexpensive parking arrangements near one's work; more instructional and research equipment financed by the university rather than by grants and contracts; better physical facilities; improved library budgets; a more highly selected student body; and less interference by the business office. These problems do not seem to be as critical as the others, however, and many of them are being attacked aggressively and with reportedly good results.

One of the most important conditions of work has consciously been left to the last. It was referred to earlier in discussing the role of central administration in personnel activities, but it is necessary to return to it and give it additional emphasis at this point. It is that tenuous and highly subjective, but critically important element which has been called the general "atmosphere" of the department and the university - the special quality of the general environment in which the professor works. This "climate," so to speak, appears to be one of the most important factors in developing and maintaining morale of staff and, consequently, in keeping them with the institution. To the extent that this factor can be detected by the casual visitor or transmitted to him by another faculty member, it also has its effect upon securing high quality personnel as well.

A part of the general climate is directly associated with the people who make up the university staff - one's colleagues in the department and in related areas, the chairman, the dean, the central administration, the chief executive of the university. What they represent individually and collectively, their attitudes, and their actions have much to do with staff attitude and morale, and thus with their acquisition and retention.

A new man coming into a department is just as much interested in the climate of that area as are the present staff in his potential contribution to it. He wants colleagues with whom he can get along, of course, but he also wants associates who possess similar values regarding scholarship, academic freedom, and professional growth. He knows his fellow-workers may have as much to do with his own success as any other single factor. It takes strength to attract strength and the reverse is likewise true. A department rent with intrigue - divided into hostile camps - is in no position to attract top scholars, but neither is a palsy-walsy group which is lifeless or commonplace in character. It is the department made up of highly competent, live, aggressive, vibrant individuals whose honest differences of opinion are not permitted to interfere with the general good, and who are united in their desire to build the strength of their area that is moving ahead professionally. And it is this kind of department which attracts men of quality.

A new man is equally interested in the university beyond the department of his immediate assignment, including the administrative officials. Some way or other administrators must create a belief that they are truly interested in the faculty - in what they think, in what they are doing, even in their personal welfare. The faculty must believe that their opinions are really desired, that they are thought to be of value and will be fully considered. They must have confidence in the administration as dedicated to scholarship, to the power of the intellect, to freedom to learn. They must believe that the administration has confidence in them to do the task at hand, in their capabilities as practitioners of the teacher's art. They must feel that they belong and are a part, an important part, of the total enterprise. They must believe that their superior officers are truly interested in their personal welfare and that they will be rewarded justly in terms of the quality of their efforts and achievements.

To achieve such reactions in any considerable proportion of the staff is a major task indeed, and the first step in this direction is for administration to free itself sufficiently from other duties to provide time for this important responsibility. Much of the proper atmosphere can be produced only through carefully conceived efforts on the part of the administrator at all levels to know the faculty, to learn what they are doing, to communicate with them. "Too many times," says a professor, "the president thinks he has communicated when he has told the deans, and the deans when they have told the department heads. Frequently, this is not the case."

The effective administrator dedicates himself to living through others, and if he is to achieve any satisfaction from his professional life, he must know something about what they are trying to do and how to help them achieve their goals. This means manifold associations, both formal and informal, with staff at all levels. In some places there is too much of a tendency, unfortunately encouraged by the natural course of events, to stratify associations. Administrators associate with administrators, they lunch together, they attend formal functions together, they meet across the conference table. Anything which will tend to modify this situation will be helpful.

A law professor points out that when he came to the university from private practice where he had been quite successful, he had to learn a complete new set of approaches to personal and professional relationships. He said in law when a man has something to say to a colleague he says it directly, cogently, and without rancor. But when he used the same approach in the university setting he found he was hurting the feelings of his colleagues and even at times incurring their wrath. "I found educators too sensitive for the direct approach," he said.

Whether this professor is correct in his judgment or not, there are many in the profession who would prefer a direct and objective approach to personnel relationships. One man reports the thing he looks forward to most each year is a conference with his head who reviews with him his achievements during the year and reports on his status. "Even if the news is bad, I like the idea," he says. Another man laments, "I'd like to know where I stand."

It is surprising to note the degree to which we fail to communicate even the positively good developments as they occur. A capable young assistant professor confided that he was unhappy he had not been promoted, that he had no notion when promotion might come, and asked whether the writer felt he should be looking for another position. He was advised to talk with his dean since this gentleman had already told the writer the young man was a "comer" and had been advanced in rank effective with the next semester. This is not an unusual occurrence. It is relatively uncommon for a man to be told why he failed to be promoted or was not given a merit salary increase, and frequently the decision simply was that he should wait a year because the recommendation was a little premature.

So much then for the factors involved in the professor's daily environment which condition his achievement and his attitude toward his work. Present in the right combinations, they support his morale, increase his sense of participation, his feeling of belongingness, and his evaluation of status. In proper combination, the presence of these factors adds materially to his achievement and thus to that of the university. The interplay of personal relations creates the atmosphere of the institution and this climate attracts or repels depending on its nature. It is not easy to analyze or to prescribe, but a highly favorable university climate is a priceless asset and a great encouragement to excellence.

Chapter VII

OBSERVATIONS ON FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

It would be presumptuous to present here a proposed program for faculty personnel administration even though very few of the universities have a carefully conceived plan of this nature. It is not beyond the realm of propriety, however, to make some observations which might serve to stimulate thought and possibly to encourage action in the direction of more systematic treatment of this important area in higher education. This chapter, then, will be devoted to a review of the investigator's general reactions to conditions as he found them, and the attitudes toward these conditions expressed through the interviews.

There is as great potential danger in the effect of an inflexible system applied without regard to the great variations existing within as well as among institutions, as in the lack of a systematic plan in this area. What is really needed is a grand design, which outlines the basic principles, assumptions, conditions, and procedures within which the plans will operate and by which their success will be evaluated. Such a pattern should serve to guide and direct the administration of the program, but at the same time should encourage broad flexibility in the adaptation of the guide lines to the specific situation. Variations should be accepted as normal conditions of operation, but clearly as conscious digressions from the design, the general pattern of which should never be ignored. It is the almost complete absence of this kind of approach to the problem which is most disturbing.

The Role of the University

It is necessary to know for what kind of an institution staff is to be employed before an intelligent search can be made for personnel, or wise decisions taken regarding their retention and promotion. The first order of business, therefore, must be to make clear to all concerned just what broad contributions are to be expected from the university as a whole and from each of its component parts.

In the first place, what kind of student body is contemplated? Is the emphasis to be primarily on the undergraduate side, or is the university basically to be an upper division and graduate unit? What proportion of the student body is expected to be underclassmen? Upper division? Graduate? Professional?

How many students are anticipated in the next five, ten, twenty years? How will they be divided among the various educational levels?

Between the liberal arts college and the professional schools? Among the professional schools? Within the departments of the liberal arts college? How many will be residents of the state and how many from out of state - how cosmopolitan will the student body be?

How selective will the institution be in the admission of students at each of the vertical levels? Will all high school graduates within the state automatically meet admission requirements? Is there to be a difference in requirements for out-of-state students? Upper division or graduate students? If selective admission is practiced, how selective are the standards?

Does the institution seek recognition nationally and internationally through the contribution of staff to research and scholarship, or does it propose primarily to be of service to the state or region? In what manner is the university expected to contribute to society, and what relative emphasis is to be placed on scholarship, instruction, and general service in the evaluation of this contribution?

There is great need for thinking and planning along the lines indicated above. True, most universities have given some attention to such problems, but for the most part the approach taken lacks the imaginative breadth and the unity of design necessary to success. For the planning to be meaningful it must be complete rather than fragmentary, detailed as well as general, concrete rather than abstract, continuing rather than sporadic. It must be applicable to each of the divisions of the university as well as to the whole. Finally, it must be understood and accepted by those responsible for administering the faculty personnel activities, as well as by the staff affected by the program.

The plan for a state university can only be conceived in terms of the total task to be performed within the state and the responsibilities of all agencies of higher education to participate. The institutional program should be constructed, with reference to the total needs of the college-age population within the state and the part to be played by other institutions in meeting the demand for higher education. For a state university to embark upon a program unilaterally without regard to to the total needs and the total facilities to meet these needs is to court disaster.

Who's In Charge Here?

A second broad policy decision which must be made early is that relating to the fundamental responsibilities which administrative officials are expected to assume in the direction and management of the faculty personnel program. Until this basic decision is made, it is impossible to proceed with the development of a comprehensive plan in this area of service. Also, if the place of administration and the administrator is carefully defined and made clear to all personnel in advance, much of the confusion and friction which many times exist in relations between faculty and administration may be avoided or at least minimized.

The policy determination is difficult at this point because basically a university represents a unique kind of environment, particularly with regard to personnel involved and their relationships with one another. The faculty are not "employees" in the ordinary sense, but colleagues engaged mutually in the conduct of an educational enterprise. Administrators are not "bosses" or even "managers" literally, but rather fellow professionals entrusted with a delicate and complex task of leadership. The methodology of a university involves the interplay of minds, one upon the other, in an effort to stimulate imagination, encourage thought, develop understanding. The product largely is mental in that it is associated with the encouragement of greater intellectual capacity, deeper insight, and maturing wisdom.

The approach of the university administrator to his job, therefore, will vary considerably from that of similar officials in other organized enterprises. In other words, he must adapt himself to the environment in which he works. He will find it necessary and desirable to recognize the quality and competency of his fellow workers, and their desire to be accepted as partners in the undertaking. He may, therefore, find it wise to emphasize "government by consensus" a good deal more than his counterpart in business and industry. Any intelligent administrator will accept both the necessity and the value of heavy dependence upon the counsel of his colleagues in the gradual maturation of policies and plans for the university. To follow any other approach is to ignore the realities of the situation, and to fail to use the specialized talents available to him.

But we are not here considering the manner in which the administrator approaches his duties, but rather the basic responsibilities which are assigned to him and which he must exercise in discharging his duties. This issue must not be confused with that of staff participation, with the legislative powers of the faculty in curricular matters, or with academic freedom in all its ramifications. It has nothing to do with the extent and nature of the counseling involved in arriving at decisions, but only with a determination of where the responsibility for decision-making resides, and who is authorized to make the recommendations relating to faculty personnel.

Fundamentally, this issue can be resolved in any one of three ways as indicated below.

1. The administrative officials can be given both the authority and the responsibility for such decisions. This approach is the least restrictive upon the powers of the administrator and makes him a truly

responsible official. It means that the department head, dean, and president make the personnel decisions for their areas and at their administrative levels, and forward the recommendations to the next echelon in each case. Further, they must not only defend the recommendations, but also be able and willing to support them fully *as their own*. Again, it must be pointed out that this approach does not in any way discourage full faculty participation in the decision-making process. The administrative decision may well coincide with faculty opinion, but the decision is the administrator's and not that of the faculty.

2. *The responsibility can be shared by the administrative officials and the faculty.* The responsibility can be divided either by asking for two sets of recommendations, one administrative and one faculty; or for a joint recommendation involving both the administrator and a faculty group. In the former case, ordinarily the recommendations will be in agreement, but occasionally the dean or the central administration will be faced with the necessity of deciding between two sets of proposals. In the latter case, the joint recommendation might read, for example, "It is recommended by the dean and the executive committee," and thus require amelioration of differences in opinion before a recommendation is made.

3. *The faculty can be given the responsibility to make the decisions and to forward the recommendations through the regularly constituted administrative officials.* This, of course, is the most restrictive approach of all, and largely eliminates the administrator from effective leadership in the personnel area. Even under these circumstances, the administrative officer theoretically has the power of veto, but close inspection demonstrates that, in reality, the implied assumption is that such matters really reside with the faculty. In effect, this approach creates two sets of administrative personnel - the regularly constituted and largely impotent administrators on the one hand, and, on the other, thefaculty committees which actually exercise the decision-making responsibility. The writer finds it difficult to accept this third approach to the decision-making process, but if it is to be employed there is no excuse for maintaining the expensive and energy-consuming duplication involved. If committees exercise the real responsibility, the chairmen of these groups should be recognized as filling the traditional roles of department heads and deans, and thus should be given such titles. This not only would avoid costly duplication, but would eliminate much of the confusion presently associated with such arrangements.

The point of this discussion, however, is not to suggest the alternative to follow (although the writer probably has demonstrated his bias), but to urge that a definite and conscious decision be made regarding the policy to be followed. No institution can avoid this issue or straddle-the-fence in resolving it. Rather than drift into a pseudo-solution, or permit power and responsibility to be assumed by the more aggressive personnel, a definite decision should be made and announced as a part of the framework upon which a faculty personnel policy will be constructed.

Recruitment and Appointment

The most obvious weakness in recruitment of faculty is the almost complete lack of long-term, comprehensive planning for staff needs. The typical university has no such general program, and with few exceptions, the usual department, school, or college within the university likewise demonstrates a lack of such foresight to a considerable degree. This becomes a particularly critical weakness in a period characterized by necessity to enlarge the staff to meet the needs of increased enrollments in the face of an inadequate supply of qualified personnel. It seems clear that in the years immediately ahead, only those universities which have carefully developed, long-range programs for the acquisition of faculty will be able to maintain the quality of their teaching personnel. Those in a poor competitive position will find such planning an absolute necessity if they are to survive as important educational agencies.

The planning must be both sweeping and detailed in character. It must start in the department or area, but be conditioned by the general philosophy of the institution, the educational objectives to be served, and the policies under which the faculty personnel program operates. Within this framework, it is necessary to forecast enrollments and curricular offerings for at least a decade, and to determine the kind of staff necessary to handle such registrations.

From the departmental viewpoint, there are two types of recruitment for which planning is necessary - (1) the replacement of those who retire or who leave the university for other reasons; and (2) the additions required or permitted by increases in enrollment or changes in the character of the department. It is essential that there exist in each department a basic staff which cannot be reduced regardless of enrollment or other factors. This core group should be well defined and understood by administrative officers as well as the immediate staff. When vacancies occur, it should not be assumed automatically that replacements will be made at the same level or in the same special content area, or for that matter, at all. Each vacancy, however, should be considered in terms of the core needs of the department and as an opportunity to move in the direction of providing better balance in the staff with relation to the long-term plan.

It should be necessary first to establish the need for a replacement. Then, the nature of the need should be defined in such manner as to indicate the kind of person demanded, the special field of interest to be represented, the maturity of scholarship required, and the rank and range of salary necessary to fill the post as defined. Actually, if the comprehensive plan has been carefully designed, most of these factors are well known at the time the vacancy occurs and, thus, merely require checking and emphasis. The program, no matter how well constructed, must be kept flexible and reexamined regularly, thus the need for reaffirmation as vacancies occur. The important thing, however, is that replacements be built to a well-defined and recognized program rather than filled in more or less haphazard fashion or in terms of the personnel most readily available. Only by taking advantage of each opportunity provided through vacancies can the department move with any degree of speed toward the ideal staff envisioned by the plan. This kind of staffing is so important that rather than deviate from the broad pattern, a department should either hold a vacancy until it can be filled properly, or make clearly temporary appointments pending an adequate solution. One of the real problems in the years immediately ahead is the temptation facing employing officials to settle for less than they want or even less than they can get either in terms of basic quality or suitability of personnel.

Additions to staff can be made either to meet the demands of increasing enrollment, or to strengthen the department as defined by the long-range program. In some cases, possibly the only immediate function to be served by the additional staff member is that of absorbing the increased registrations, but even under these circumstances it is important that no opportunity be lost to strengthen the faculty at the same time teaching power is added. If a definite agreement has been reached regarding future needs, many times appointments which are made at lower ranks, primarily to take care of additional classes, can also provide potential recruits for the basic program. Since a considerable proportion of the senior staff in most universities is obtained by promotion from the lower ranks, recruitment at the instructor and assistant professor levels cannot be considered apart from the long-range design for the department.

There is another aspect to planning for staff additions which is equally critical and equally neglected in most of the universities. This is the necessity to develop and maintain continuously a "prospects file" which matches the future staff design and needs in detail. It should be the responsibility of each professional school and each department of the liberal arts college to keep an up-to-date list of possibilities classified by fields of interest, experience, and scholarly background which dovetails with the staff design, and to which officials may turn when vacancies occur or are anticipated. The development and maintenance of such listings will require considerable effort on the part of the staff, and is costly to maintain in proper fashion, but the program will more than pay for itself in the improved recruitment practices which will result from its utilization.

One file should include detailed records on those students who are about to complete terminal degrees in the graduate or professional schools to which the institution usually turns for recruits, and in the appropriate areas of interest. Once these files are established, it should not be too difficult to extend the records to cover the early years of the individual's experience following completion of his preparation whether he is teaching or working some other assignment.

A second file should list a small group of mature and successful scholars in each area of academic speciality who conceivably could be moved if the opportunity were sufficiently attractive. Naturally, where central personnel files are kept by national professional organizations or by government agencies, the local institution should take advantage of such services, but only to aid in the development of its own prospects, not as a substitute. It should also be clear that the files are not lists of applicants in the formal sense, but rather a record of those who seem best to qualify for the type of assignment which is or might become available locally.

This is such an important element in the development of quality and appropriateness in faculty that a professional staff member should devote considerable time in supervising the construction and maintenance of such records in each of the schools and departments. The dean or the department head in the smaller units probably can assume this responsibility, but in the more comprehensive units the administrator will want to appoint a special official to care for such duties. The entire departmental staff will be involved in the search, of course, but it is essential that the direction be held by a staff member who can look upon the assignment as one of his principal duties.

Much of the difficulty in securing the kind of staff desired is related to the time which is given to the search. Characteristically, very little attention is devoted to the problem until a vacancy occurs, and even when it is known that additions must be made to the staff, the efforts at recruitment are started too late to be most effective. One of the major deterrents to early recruitment is the fact that state universities ordinarily do not know very far in advance whether funds will be available for new positions. This fact, while it retards long-range activity somewhat, need not unduly delay efforts at procurement. If an adequate plan has been developed, early steps in the acquisition of staff can be taken in advance of final budget decisions, so that when funds become available, the university is prepared to move with dispatch.

More effort should be directed to the anticipation of vacancies so that a year or two can be devoted to the appointment of the best available person to fill a new or vacated post. Ideally, the department head should have two or three persons in mind as likely replacements for each position, should some emergency arise or the simple action of time create a vacancy.

Teams of field workers should be organized and sent from the local campus to recruit candidates for anticipated vacancies. Today, field visits are limited largely to hurried trips by the department heads or deans who are concerned primarily with the immediate vacancies in their areas. Such visits might well be continued, but they should be supplemented by calls from regular recruitment teams to the major graduate schools and professional centers designed to ferret out possibilities for the long-term personnel requirements of their universities. Professors should be released from campus duty for a term or a semester and assigned to make calls upon the "supply universities," to meet the potential candidates, and to check upon their qualifications. This activity not only would aid materially in building the "prospect files," but also would improve remarkably the knowledge available on candidates once the institution becomes interested in them. The smaller universities might have to limit such visits to one man from each of the broad academic and professional areas, but the larger institutions can operate on a more specialized basis. The returns from such a relatively small investment of time and money would be more than sufficient to justify the outlay, and the results would be cumulative in effect. The visits would provide not only a list of prospects but would add greatly to the validity of judgments on prospective personnel, would make it possible to check recommendations directly, and would generally provide a more reliable base from which to operate once one of the prospects became a candidate. The field program would not substitute for visits to the campus by selected personnel once they come under active consideration, but it would establish a base upon which local conferences could be constructed and would make these latter contacts much more meaningful.

The field teams should not limit themselves to an analysis of prospects about to complete their graduate or professional preparation and ready to enter the teaching profession for the first time. The search should include three levels of personnel prospects: (1) neophytes about ready to enter the profession, (2) young men with some experience and much promise, and (3) mature individuals who have demonstrated ability and potential for continued growth.

Nothing has been said in this section regarding the factors which should be considered in the selection of staff. This is a conscious omission based on the fact that considerable attention is devoted to this matter in the section on Evaluating Meritorious Service, pp. 119 to 124, and there seems to be no reason to duplicate the comments at this point. The qualities determining selection will correspond closely to those which are used in arriving at promotions, tenure decisions, and merit salary adjustments; thus, a program developed for use at such points can easily be modified for utilization at the other.

Academic Rank

Tremendous time and energy are consumed annually in determining whether or not various members of the staff are qualified for promotion. Judgments are required when a staff member is advanced from instructor to assistant professor, to associate professor, and to full professor. In some institutions it is also necessary to decide separately on the question of tenure. Not only do such decisions involve time but they also take their toll in wear and tear on the individuals concerned. Many unfortunate associations have become intertwined with the promotion system. Status is measured in considerable degree by rank and the speed with which it is attained. Men (and their wives) become frustrated because of delays in promotion, or slowness in such developments, as compared with friends or colleagues. Rank has become a symbol of success to many and is something to be prized far beyond its material or, for that matter, professional value.

Basically, evaluation for the purpose of determining status should be reduced to a one-time affair. This can be done only by associating such assessment with the decision relating to permanent tenure rather than with academic rank. This result can be accomplished only by the complete elimination of levels of rank. While it is not expected that the ensuing recommendation will be followed by many institutions, it is urged that the university faculty be organized into three groups as follows:

1. Temporary Staff. This group should include part-time staff members, graduate and research assistants, full-time instructors working toward terminal degrees, lecturers, visiting staff members, and others who clearly are temporary personnel and, thus, not to be considered for permanent employment. Membership in this group should be limited to a maximum of five years except for part-time personnel.

2. Probationary Staff. This group should be composed of those staff members who are serving an apprenticeship period in the institution. They are qualified by training to serve as permanent staff members, but, because of lack of teaching experience or other limiting factors, they must undergo a trial period before a decision on tenure is reached. They should be given a characteristic title such as staff associate or adjunct professor. The term of service in this category should vary with conditions, but under no circumstances should it go beyond five years.

3. Permanent Staff. This group should be made up of those who are on continuing appointment. They compose the staff which can be dismissed only for cause. They are the heart of the faculty and should make up a majority of the personnel. All of them should carry the title of "professor." Obviously, they will vary immensely in age, experience, maturity, and - as a result - in salary.

The net effect of this three-fold organization of staff will be to reduce the number of decisions relating to status to a single one, that which revolves around the question: Is this person qualified to become a permanent staff member of the institution? Does he possess in sufficient degree and in proper combination, those qualities considered essential to membership in our group? If the answer is yes, he is made a permanent staff member and automatically assumes the title of "professor." If the answer is no, or in doubt, he is automatically denied this privilege and separated from the university.

The advantages of such an organization are numerous. The evaluation is concentrated around a single issue and the only relevant one. Once it is made, future assessments can be concentrated on the problem of merit salary adjustments. The struggle for status, if not eliminated, is at least reduced in intensity. The time and energy saved can be centered on important matters. A symbol is eliminated and the individual's basic drives, therefore, can more clearly be directed toward real merit in the profession rather than an illusory status. And what is lost by such an arrangement?

Evaluating Meritorious Service

Regardless of whether the proposed organization of staff or the more traditional pattern is followed, it is necessary at times to make qualitative evaluations of faculty to determine their readiness for promotion, permanent tenure or merit salary adjustments. In fact, it would seem that the most satisfactory operation is that in which the faculty are appraised on a continuing basis, so that at any point along the way it is possible with relatively little extra effort to reach a judgment on a particular issue. There should be a constant flow of information relating accomplishments of the individual staff member to be processed routinely and added to his permanent record in the central files. If meaningful and effective practice is to result, the data must be organized and recorded in such manner as to provide the basis for critical evaluation whenever it is necessary to determine the status of the person involved. A simple chronological listing of achievements in itself is of no great value. In fact, where such practice is followed it probably indicates the lack of any clearly developed criteria for the measurement of merit. It might be well, therefore, to take a look at the major steps necessary to establish an adequate program of faculty evaluation.

1. It is first essential that each institution determine those factors which are to be evaluated in assessing merit. At first glance this would seem to be a simple matter, but as the problem is explored it becomes anything but that. It is easy to list the qualities which will be considered such as: (a) teaching ability, (b) scholarship, (c) service to the university and the state and, (d) personality. But, of course, this is just the beginning of the task. The big problem involves

a definition of the terms which not only clarifies the concepts themselves, but, more importantly, makes it possible for the institution to measure qualitatively the degree to which they exist in the individual. Until we know clearly what it is we wish to evaluate, any effort at measurement and apprisal will prove to be abortive.

This, of course, is a difficult assignment, but one which cannot be dodged if we wish to develop a valid program. It should hardly be necessary to point to the inadequacy, for example, of stating boldly that one of the basic qualifications for promotion is "teaching ability," and then simply asking an administrator or a faculty committee to indicate whether or not the individual involved possesses this characteristic and to what degree. Actually, however, this is about the extent of the effort in many institutions. It would seem that the university is faced squarely with the necessity either of (1) defining in some specificity what is meant by superior teaching ability, or (2) eliminating this quality from those which are included in the evaluation of merit.

This is not the place to enter upon a lengthy discussion of teaching prowess and its measurement, but some comments are worthy of note. Certainly, as many students can testify, this is a most difficult and comprehensive problem for which there are no easy solutions. On the other hand, it is sheer nonsense to assume nothing can be done in the area if we seriously work at it. If two sets of superstition and folklore can be avoided, real progress can be made. On the one hand, the smug complacency of those who insist a teacher is born and not made must be recognized as at best a partial truth. On the other hand, the naiveté of those who believe the answer rests simply with strong background in subject matter or (depending on the individual) the completion of a methods course or some supervised teaching, must also be disregarded as less than truth. When these two shibboleths are discarded, it it possible to look the problem squarely in the face and begin seeking answers to the question: What makes the teacher effective?

In all probability, there is no single and certainly no simple answer to the question, but progress can be made, and on the basis of this progress tools for measurement and evaluation can be developed. It is quite unlikely that the techniques of assessment can or should be completely objective, but they should result in removing a considerable part of the guesswork. Actually, no other choice exists - either teaching success must be evaluated on some intelligent basis or it should not be included among those factors related to promotion and salary adjustment. The latter alternative is impossible in an institution which promulgates as one of its major functions that of instructing the youth of the land.

A similar problem exists in working with the other factors which are included in the assessment of merit. What is meant by scholarship, for example? Is it a quality of the mind which keeps the professor abreast of current developments in the field and which he displays imaginatively in all aspects of his intellectual activity including teaching? Or, does this term refer to a more limited intellectual activity called "research"? Or, do we really mean productivity as evidenced by publication of papers in scholarly journals? And if we mean the latter, do we think in quantitative or qualitative terms? Obviously, these and other questions must be answered if the concept is to be clarified, and before we determine upon the methods and techniques of measurement to be used in its assessment.

Likewise, it is necessary to analyze in some detail what is meant by service to the institution and the state, before any reliable means can be established for assessing a qualitative performance in this area. Further, if personality is regarded as significant to advancement, the specific personal qualities considered important must be identified and defined as a first step in their evaluation. Where other characteristics are to be considered in the measurement of meritorious service, they too should be treated in the same manner. In each case it is first necessary to define the factor in sufficient detail and specificity as to make it possible to develop carefully constructed methods and techniques for measuring and scaling the quality. Until this first task is completed, little progress can be made in evaluating merit.

One final generalization is important here. The above discussion should not be taken as a plea for objectifying what in effect is a subjective problem, and one which always will involve a high degree of human judgment in its assessment. There is as great danger in the development of detailed "point systems" or "measuring scales" where the highest totals are used to support the greatest or most rapid advancement, as there is in the present rather blind approach to the problem. Scales and similar objective measures undoubtedly have their place in evaluation of merit, but to depend completely on such instruments is a great mistake. It is necessary to keep in mind always that a judgment must be achieved based upon as much pertinent data as can be accumulated, but this judgment will be qualitative in nature and in considerable degree subjective in character.

2. Once the factors to be assessed are clearly defined and the method as well as the instruments for evaluation identified, the second major step can be taken. This step involves a determination of the uses to be made of such evaluations in recommending individual adjustments in rank and salary status. How is each of the major factors to be weighted in reaching such determinations? Is it necessary that the professor demonstrate the possession of each of the characteristics to a certain degree? If so, what represents minimum qualification in each of the areas? Under what circumstances, if any, will a person possessing one of these attributes in maximum degree be excused from meeting minimum in the others? For example, will an outstanding teacher who is weak in productive research be given top salary and rank? Will an extremely productive scholar be moved along despite his inadequte performance in the

classroom or his lack of interest in service? What combination of qualities will cause a man to progress the most rapidly through the ranks and the salary pattern? These questions illustrate the myriad of queries which must be considered and which are more or less constantly in the minds of those who are affected by the promotion policies. They also serve to indicate how involved the implementation of merit evaluations can be in a major institution.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that careful consideration forces one to accept the idea that there is no single pathway to academic progress. It is the failure of many institutions to recognize this fact that creates sometimes an illusion of duplicity in the management of personnel activities. As the faculty examine into practice they observe that a given promotion can be justified on one basis, while another can only be explained on the basis of other factors. As a result they assume that no policy, other than the operation of fortuitous circumstances, is functioning in the institution. While at times this conclusion is sound, it also is possible to explain the variations in terms of policy, since any carefully-conceived program will recognize a variety of routes to advancement.

Unfortunately, there is a tendency for institutions to announce programs for promotion of staff which correspond neither with the facts of life nor with practice in the university concerned. Frequently, universities state that promotions will be based on the demonstration of adequate performance in all recognized areas, such as (a) teaching, (b) research, (c) service, and (d) personality, accompanied by a record of outstanding achievement in one or two of them. But observation of what actually happens demonstrates that promotions and salary adjustments are made regularly which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be justified under such a policy if any sort of creditable standard of performance is demanded. The major error undoubtedly is in the assumption that all advancement can be based upon such an inflexible pattern of evaluation. Basically, a university thrives upon diversity among the staff and this should mean, among other things, that the individual will be encouraged to contribute to the institution in his own unique manner. If this assumption is correct, the rewards for performance also must be based upon a system of evaluation sufficiently flexible as to recognize such diverse contributions.

The problem is to define the various pathways which can be followed to advancement, and to detail the combinations of attributes which are necessary to successful movement along the route in each case. The difficulty is to make certain that the definitions of policy correspond to general practice, and that exceptions can be explained without stretching credulity to the breaking point. Does the well-balanced person actually have as much chance for progress as the "hot-shot" researcher? Can one really concentrate on teaching and expect to reach the top? What combinations of talent speed advancement along the road?

Does longevity have anything to do with advancement? Is there truly a minimum level of performance required in all areas of service, or is this a fiction? These questions are most important to those who look ahead to service and advancement in a university, and particularly to the young and able staff members who can be motivated at this stage by either selfish or altruistic considerations. The university, not only in fairness to personnel, but in order to direct talent into proper and effective channels, must define carefully the various routes to advancement. When this task is completed, much of the problem is solved.

3. The third step is the development and clarification of procedures to be followed in evaluating merit and arriving at decisions regarding promotion, tenure, and salary adjustments. This task involves the preparation of an outline listing the steps to be followed in making the analysis, as well as an acknowledgment of the role to be played by various members of the staff individually and collectively. In what manner, by whom, and when is the recommendation originated? What advice is sought along the way? What part is played by one's colleagues? What is the role of the dean and the central administration in the process? Is there any review by faculty other than departmental colleagues and if so, what is the role of such groups? What is the timing of various steps in the procedure and when is a decision reached? How is the individual informed of the decision and what explanation is made, particularly of negative actions?

Suffice it to say here that the procedures to be followed should be clearly delineated along with the respective roles of all concerned in the evaluative process. Deviations from the procedural base should be permitted rarely, and then only when they can be justified to the satisfaction of all concerned. Machinery should be kept as simple as possible to accomplish the ends desired, lest the mechanisms and the procedures become ends in themselves.

4. The fourth step is implied in the first three, and has been hinted at along the way. This encompasses the development of a simple but effective program of communications in this area of personnel activity. It should be pointed out that if faculty members have been involved and their advice sought in the course of developing the policies, definitions, instruments, methods, and evaluative procedures, the problem is vastly simplified. Even under these circumstances, however, there is need for a carefully planned informational program designed to make certain that staff is informed continuously of all aspects of the activity. All the faculty should know what it is that is being evaluated, how it is done and the people responsible for doing it. There also should be a definite program for informing individuals quickly and adequately of decisions affecting their own status, and for pointing out especially the causes of delays or negative action. It is particularly important to explain what are or appear to be deviations from policy. Such services can

be vindicated simply as effective management, but their major justification grows out of the effect they have on morale and its consequent influence upon the quality of the university program.

One final comment on the problem of evaluating and rewarding meritorious service to the university. Something as important as this to the life of the institution requires careful and continuous attention. Universities generally have been weak in studying their internal problems objectively and with the same degree of thoroughness devoted to other research activities. This condition should not be permitted to continue in this and other important educational areas. Where a division of institutional research already exists, it should be assigned the continuing problem of assessing the system of personnel evaluations and making recommendations for improvement of policies, methods, and machinery.[1] This constant review, accompanied by regular evaluations from the administration in consultation with appropriate faculty groups, should aid materially in the development of a program well adapted to reward (and thus more likely retain) those who are contributing most effectively to the objectives of the institution. Such a systematic and scholarly attack on the problem will go far toward convincing the faculty that a sincere and intelligent effort is being made to reward performance, and thus the morale of the entire establishment is likely to be improved.

Faculty Salaries

A fixed salary schedule, while popular with the faculty, tends inevitably to become restrictive and to reduce in considerable measure the ability to reward merit and to seek excellence in staff. On the other hand, it is impossible to justify the haphazard treatment of the salary situation which is characteristic of some universities, where salary seems to be almost a matter of individual negotiation. There must be some pattern to the salary operations, and this design must be based on certain fundamental principles of operation. The following set of policies is suggested for consideration:

1. The pattern should be as flexible as possible to provide the utmost freedom in securing, for all areas, the quality of staff desired and in so rewarding staff members as to reduce materially the attrition rates among top quality personnel.

2. There should be a minimum salary for each rank but no ceiling, thus permitting and providing for a considerable overlap in salaries among ranks. The minimum starting salary should vary from area to

---

[1] If such an agency does not exist, something of this nature should be established.

area depending upon supply and demand factors largely beyond control of the institution. The range of salaries should be considerable, thus providing for maximums in all areas which are attractive and which will encourage the best people to remain in the institution. The maximum salaries should be attainable in any area on the campus given the degree of excellence in staff demanded by such levels of remuneration.

3. Salary increases should be of two kinds: (a) automatic, and (b) merit. The automatic salary increases should be limited in the case of instructors and assistant professors to the first three years, and for associate and full professors to the first two years of service. The automatic adjustments should approximate 5 to 7 per cent of the base salary each year and should be budgeted regularly. For example, an instructor employed at $5,000 might receive $5,350, $5,700 and $6,000, and an associate professor employed originally at $8,000 would be paid $8,500 and $9,000 in successive years. Beyond this point all salary adjustments should be based on merit carefully evaluated on the basis of total accomplishments during the period involved. Wide variation in increments should characterize the distribution of merit adjustments and obviously those who demonstrate little or no merit should be treated accordingly.

The only "across-the-board" adjustments should be those associated with changes in minimum salaries. Whenever the minimum of a given rank is adjusted upward, all salaries in this rank should be increased by the amount of the minimum adjustment.

If staff is reorganized as suggested earlier to include only one rank for the permanent faculty, the automatic salary period should cover a two-year span and should approximate 5-7 per cent of the base salary annually, rounded off for easier handling. The theory behind this and the earlier suggestion on automatic salary adjustments during the early years of employment is that the arrangement provides a two- or three-year period during which the staff member may become adjusted to the new post and demonstrate his capabilities and potentialities to those responsible for his future status. Such an arrangement makes it unnecessary to prepare qualitative evaluations of the professor too early in his service. On the other hand, it forces such an assessment in two or three years when it should be possible to construct such evaluations intelligently.

4. Suggestions relating to salary levels have a way of becoming dated very fast in these days of changing dollar values. Certainly it can be said that, for the most part, starting salaries are too low as are the maximums paid at the various ranks. As has been reported, salaries in the upper ranks generally have not kept pace as well as those at the lower levels. None is sufficiently high to insure the acquisition and retention of the quality staff required in the face of supply and competition, and this situation will get worse in the next decade.

Certainly, as of 1959, an instructor with terminal degree should be paid a minimum of $6,000; an assistant professor, $7,500; an associate professor $9,000; and a professor $11,000 for the academic year, if the profession is to attract the kind of people desired and necessary to do the job. One of the reasons so few instructors are being appointed today is that the salaries are so low the positions cannot be filled. The larger universities, naturally, should have higher minimums, and obviously special areas of instruction will have to go beyond the base for starting salaries to secure equally competent personnel. Likewise, top salaries in all ranks must be lifted considerably. The smaller universities should be able to pay professors up to $18,000 or $20,000, and the large units should lift maximums to $30,000 for really distinguished men.

5. Consideration should be given to the possibility of placing all staff with the rank of assistant professor or higher, on a twelve-month basis. While, at this point, the suggestion is made as a means of providing greater annual pay (for more service, of course) to the professor, there are other advantages to such an arrangement, the most meaningful of which is the greater flexibility involved. If the professor were available on a year-around basis and his schedule of work planned over the twelve-month period he could be used with much greater effect. It is true that the summer months represent periods of relatively low enrollment in most universities, and this creates something of a problem in staff utilization. On the other hand, if research and service are considered an important part of the professor's duties, the year-around appointment can best be adapted to provide for these activities. If the demands for teaching are greater during the fall, winter and spring, the staff can be assigned a larger proportion of teaching duties during this period, and given opportunity to do research and writing in summer when the teaching requirements are lighter. This arrangement requires that a special schedule be developed and approved for each staff member, but the net effect should be the better utilization of his talents on a twelve-month basis. It is suggested, therefore, that as salary funds become available, the possibility be considered of providing in this manner a real increase in income and also establishing a more flexible and adaptable use of staff. Those who do not care for twelve months employment or who wish to do other work in summer could be given leaves without pay for the period.

6. Universities have not explored sufficiently the possibility of contributions to the professor's economic welfare other than direct salary payments. This is an area which should be studied and which offers real possibilities. It might well be that social pressures will, in effect, put a top on the salaries that can be paid the professor but, in terms of current experience, such pressures will not act to restrict other emoluments of office.

Already universities have accepted responsibility for making payments toward the professor's retirement, and some are contributing on a two-for-one basis. This favorable ratio could be increased and the total retirement contribution enlarged at the same time. Even if this is done at the expense of a portion of the salary increment, it has the advantage of deferring the income tax on the university contribution to a time when the individual income and, thus, the tax payment is lower. There is no reason why a similar sharing of health, medical and life insurance costs could not be instituted. There is nothing radical in the suggestion - business has been making similar contributions for a number of years, and labor unions are moving more definitely in this direction all the time. These and other possibilities should be examined carefully, not only or even primarily from the humanitarian point of view, but out of sheer necessity to become competitive in the constant struggle for talented manpower. The intensity of this conflict is only in its early stages, and the state university cannot meet its obligations unless it moves quickly to insure an excellent and dedicated staff.

Teaching Load

The teaching load should be established on a standard basis primarily as a guide to general practice. For example, in estimating the number of staff required it might be assumed that the typical load is to be 12, 9 or 6 hours (4, 3 or 2 courses) depending on the institution. Immediately, however, it will be recognized that two types of deviations from this very general criterion must be practiced as follows:

1. Certain academic units, because of differences in the way they operate, may require a modified quantitative standard. Such adjustments are especially necessary in small units, such as law, where there is little opportunity to average out loads among a large staff and where traditionally the methods of teaching are assumed to place a heavier unit load on the professor.

2. Teaching is only one part of the total load, and must be recognized as such. In measuring staff load, all elements involved in the professor's assignment must be equated. It should be expected, therefore, that the teaching load will vary upward or downward from the standard depending upon the intensity of the other approved activities being carried by the professor. If he is doing little but teach, his load should go up a class or so beyond the standard. If his other activities are heavy, his teaching load should be reduced appropriately. These deviations could well be temporal in nature - thus a professor might carry a heavy teaching assignment one semester or year, and a light one another period depending on the ebb and flow of his other professional activities.

This variable and highly individualized approach to the professor's assignment can only be managed within the department by the department head, under the general direction and sympathetic supervision of the dean. Basically, the college and the department should be given a budget for personnel based on the generally accepted standard of teaching load corrected for variations in methodology or functions among the various schools and colleges, and then told to get the job done. Within broad limits, the head should be permitted to adapt the individual teaching assignments as necessary, remaining responsible always to defend his judgment and explain his practice. Experience should be reviewed and evaluated regularly so that unjustifiable extremes can be corrected.

Teaching load, measured by the clock hours of contact with students, has decreased steadily over the past few years. The reduction usually is justified under the assumption that all professors must have time for research and writing if they are to develop adequate scholarship and recognition among their colleagues. It is entirely appropriate for the gifted scholar to be given time for the research he is competent to pursue, and for the publication of results. But to assume that all university faculty members have equal interest or competency in the research area is to ignore the realities of the situation. Many valuable staff members neither possess the burning desire to concentrate heavily in research nor the ability to accomplish production on a sufficiently high qualitative level to justify devoting a major portion of their time to such activities. They may, and possibly should, carry on some research or other scholarly activities, but their major contribution to the university will be in different areas of service. To apply the same measuring stick in evaluating load for all faculty members, therefore, would be both unwise and ineffective.

In fact, some of the suggestions which propose a very minimum teaching load border on the ludicrous even when applied to the productive scholar. There is nothing wrong with the assignment of personnel full time to research in laboratories, institutes and other such agencies which function primarily as research centers. It is natural for staff members working in institutions which are devoted primarily to advanced graduate or post-graduate students to be freed largely from formal teaching duties. But even distinguished scholars, assigned to teaching departments in the typical university setting, should devote a significant portion of their time to instruction, formal or informal.

This is the basic reason for the adoption of a teaching norm for a given university which requires a significant amount of teaching from the typical professor, but which permits considerable variability both ways from the standard load. The teacher who devotes little time to research or to other approved activities might reasonably be expected to teach as much as 9 or even 12 hours depending on the characteristics of the assignment and his own experience. On the other hand, this is obviously too much of a load for the man who is conducting a major research program. Here is where extreme flexibility in assignment around the norm becomes most important.

Retirement From The Faculty

It is suggested that the basic retirement age be placed at 70, but that this status be approached gradually over the last three years of service to the university. Normally, under such program, the professor would be employed full time through his sixty-seventh year, be reduced to three-fourths time in his sixty-eighth year, to have time in his sixty-ninth year, and to full retirement at 70. The arrangement not only permits the older staff member to adapt gradually to a different income status, but also encourages him to develop progressively new interests to replace those which are being eliminated as a result of his changed employment status.

If such a program is to be effective, however, it should be accompanied by a carefully devised plan concentrated in these latter years of service and designed to aid the professor prepare himself for retirement. It is disconcerting that so little of this nature is done by the institutions today, in spite of all the emphasis higher learning is placing on the study of geriatrics and gerontology.

Contributions to retirement on the part of the university should be established on the basis of at least two dollars for every dollar provided by the professor. The total contribution should be sufficient to provide in retirement at least 50 per cent of the highest salary after twenty years of service in addition to social security payments. Where state retirement systems exist, the possibility of reciprocity should be explored so that a professor could take with him the entire retirement contribution, the university's as well as his own, should he transfer to another institution.

More attention should be given by the university to the professor in retirement than currently is the practice. Wherever possible office space, and secretarial service should be made available if he desires them. He should not only be carried on faculty lists in all the official publications as an emeritus staff member, but should be encouraged to attend faculty meetings and other university activities. At relatively little cost such persons could be presented with life-time passes to many university events, and in other ways made to feel that they not only are appreciated but that they still belong to the faculty. Few would take full advantage of these courtesies, but the fact that they are available would in itself cause those in retirement to believe that their long service to higher education is not forgotten by the university.

At the same time the compulsory retirement age is advanced to 70, the voluntary retirement age should be moved in the other direction. The individual concerned should be able to request retirement for cause at 55 years of age. The university, for equally good reasons, should be able to retire, or put on part-time, staff members who have reached the age of 55. The writer is not prepared to suggest the kind of program which should be developed to provide an adequate income for the few who would retire prematurely under such arrangements, but the relatively small investment involved would bring returns to the university as well as the individuals concerned far beyond the cost.

The Role of Central Administration

From this point it is assumed that a decision has been made to provide responsible administrative officials in whom also is vested the legal authority to recommend personnel action to the next level of responsibility. Further, it is presupposed that these officials will act aggressively to give responsible and imaginative leadership to the faculty personnel activities of the institution.

1. A first assignment of central administration thus defined is that of developing and communicating the basic principles underlying the pattern of faculty personnel, and the detailed procedures by which these activities are to be managed. Sufficient time should be taken in the construction of the program to permit full consultation with administrative and faculty groups, though in the end it must be established officially by the governing board of the institution upon recommendation of the chief executive. Such a plan should present in considerable detail the fundamental principles upon which personnel decisions are based, the specific responsibilities of administrative officials and faculty, and the definite procedures to be followed in carrying out policy. Flexibility of administration and continuous review, both of policies and procedures, should be built into the pattern from the beginning. At the same time a determined effort should be made to state the principles and policies in language which is sufficiently concrete and specific as to be meaningful and administrable.

Communication takes place in two distinct ways: (a) in oral or written (including pictured) form, and (b) through the decision-making process itself. Certainly, every effort must be made to report to administration and faculty the bases of operation, and to discuss in exhaustive detail such policies along with the procedures involved. But in the end, the faculty will believe in principles, policies, and procedures as they see them work out in practice. It does not help to announce that promotions, for example, will be based on outstanding teaching ability unless this happens frequently enough to be noticed. It matters little if the by-laws state that faculty must be consulted in appointments if such requirements are flaunted in practice. It is necessary also to develop a program for explaining and interpreting decisions as they develop, particularly those which are or appear to be exceptions to policy and practice.

2. A second responsibility of central administration is that of selecting and indoctrinating administrative colleagues. Since major dependence will be placed on deans and department heads for the administration of the program within the framework of policy developed, it is important that such personnel be carefully selected as suitable and effective instruments for the appropriate conduct of the enterprise. The central administration cannot avoid responsibility for the appointment of these officials any more than it can escape the consequences of their actions. The president must, therefore, take an active part in such appointments and, while advising and consulting fully, must be convinced of the wisdom of the selection in each case. He must also be prepared to take the necessary steps to remove inadequate personnel from such key posts once it becomes apparent that a change is dictated.

Deans should be appointed on an annual but continuing basis, and it is essential that an atmosphere be created where, when it is necessary for the good of the institution, a change can be made without major psychological complications. To accomplish such ends the executive head of the institution must have a relationship with his colleagues which, while friendly and open, is characterized by its objectivity, frankness, and impersonal approach to professional problems. It should not, under these circumstances, be a major calamity for a dean to return to a professorship. In fact, it probably would be good for the profession if this happened occasionally.

The appointment of department chairmen is more clearly the responsibility of the dean than of central administration, but the president cannot be unmindful of these decisions either. He should discuss possibilities with the dean in broad, general terms before a decision is made. In each case he should be convinced of the wisdom of the appointment before according his approval.

The president undoubtedly will exercise the above responsibilities directly in the smaller institutions, but in the larger units he may wish to delegate a large measure of his authority to a deputy in his office. It is suggested, however, that there be appointed to the president's staff a senior administrator whose major or sole responsibility is that of working continuously with faculty personnel. Such a person should have both line and staff responsibilities varying with the institution and the chief executive. In the large university, he should be given specialized assistance in the accomplishment of his task. This officer should report directly to the president or in large universities through the academic vice-president or dean of faculties. He should, regardless of organization, exercise real responsibility in the area.

3. Third, the central staff must exercise a review function over important recommendations relating to faculty personnel. The review should never be perfunctory, but neither should it be stultifying. It should serve to insure that appropriate procedures have been followed, that acceptable standards have been maintained, and that basic principles have been sustained, or if ignored, that the reasons for the deviation are fully explained. While the central administration must be prepared to exercise a veto where necessary over recommendations of the deans, such action should rarely be required. It can ordinarily be avoided through developing the practice of informal discussions and conferences in advance of important recommendations so that differences of opinion or possible misunderstandings of policy can be eliminated or at least anticipated in advance.

The president or his deputy, who exercises responsibility for the final review of recommendations relating to faculty personnel, should be advised and counselled by a small committee (five to nine people) composed of non-administrative faculty members elected by and from the faculty at large and broadly representative of this group. This committee should conduct a continuing review of policies, plans, and procedures in several areas of university activity, including faculty personnel, and should recommend, for the president's consideration, modifications which seem justifiable or desirable.[2] The committee should be advisory in nature but should be given full freedom to range broadly and deeply over the entire area of interest.

Ordinarily, this group should not become involved with individual cases, since to do so would bury them in detail and reduce their effectiveness with the larger aspects of the problem. However, occasionally either at the request of the administrator, or on their own volition, they may wish to make a critical review of a specific recommendation and to give their advice to the executive on the particular case. Such occasional reviews give the administrator an opportunity to profit from a fresh and university-wide approach, and they give the faculty a feeling that they have friends in court watching over their status and, in a sense, protecting their rights.

The key to this aspect of the committee's work is to keep the review of individual cases to an absolute minimum to avoid undue interference with the more important activities related to broad policy matters. Under no circumstances should either the president or members permit the committee to become a detailed reviewing agency, or to make decisions which are the responsibility of the president as the administrative head of the institution. Their strength as a committee rests in their ability to remain completely detached from the operational side of the program so that they can review it critically and thus suggest wisely the modifications necessary in policies and plans to make the program more effective.

---

[2] The chief executive will be receiving like recommendations from committees of administrative officers who will be making similar, continuing reviews of operations.

4. Fourth, the central administration must serve to facilitate or expedite the faculty personnel program in all its many aspects. The most obvious function of this nature is that of securing from the legislature and other sources the funds necessary to operate the kind of program desired. It is not enough to provide merely for basic operations, but in addition, the administrator must manage to find support for salary increments, additional staff, and the other adjustments necessary to put quality into the university program. This is one aspect of his assignment which the president will find difficult to share with others.

The distribution of funds as the budget is developed is another and effective means, controlled largely by central administration, for facilitating or retarding developments in given academic areas. This results first from the relative emphasis placed upon allotments to such factors as (a) numbers of faculty supported, (b) salary levels for staff, (c) equipment and personnel provided for research, (d) funds for faculty travel, and (e) support for fringe benefits. By accentuating these or similar areas through budgetary support, the administrator can condition materially the quality and the morale of the faculty. Then, too, by selecting with the help of colleagues, those areas of academic concentration which are to be given special attention and support, the president can condition materially both the personnel and the program of the institution.

Finally, the president can act as expediter by making quite clear to deans and department heads the nature of their authority and responsibility for the administration of faculty personnel. This in turn should facilitate and speed up the entire process of decision-making in the area. Much of the unrest which exists in faculties can be traced to confusion, lack of information, or misunderstanding relating to the roles of various officials in personnel operations. The procedures followed in arriving at decisions should be clearly outlined and understood by all concerned, and it is the obligation of the central administration to see that this condition obtains. By word and deed the president can encourage his colleagues to be frank and direct in handling personnel matters expediously and with fairness to all.

5. Finally, the central administration must assume responsibility for the development of a comprehensive personnel record system covering the detailed history of each individual faculty member from the date of his first employment. The central files should be kept in the president's office with copies in the college or school offices. The archives should include not only full personal and professional data, but also notations in diary form covering the personnel history. Rarely are the latter type

kept particularly with regard to decisions which deny or delay a promotion. This aspect of the history ought to include memos summarizing understandings or agreements reached in conference whether such be to approve, disapprove, defer, or delay the recommendation. The memo should be initialed by all those who participate in the decision. This type of record is infrequently kept and, when it is attempted, only sporadically recorded. Such logs would eliminate misunderstandings which sometimes develop regarding just what was decided and the degree of unanimity with which the decision was reached. They also would chronicle for further reference the reasons for decisions, certainly those that do not agree with the recommendations. Such detailed but important data are at present conspicuous by their absence.

The forms for the posting of data will vary institution by institution depending upon those items which are considered in evaluating the history and performance of the individual. For this reason, there would be no particular advantage in suggesting a form at this point. Suffice it here simply to urge that such comprehensive records be kept and used in personnel work. Naturally, individual departments will want their own files on their individual staff members. Whether these are copies of the central files or not is immaterial, if the data required centrally are included.

The president can neither abdicate his responsibility for building and maintaining an excellent faculty nor permit himself to become insulated from this program. Regardless of the size or complexity of the institution over which he presides, he must bring his full influence to bear continually on the up-grading of faculty personnel. He must stand for excellence in staff and his every move should reflect this point of view in unmistakable terms. This is an obligation which he cannot delegate because it remains with him constantly whether or not he is conscious of the fact. He must at least be the symbol for quality performance in all academic matters, but especially for those relating to faculty.

The role of the president is varied, of course, but in general his major function in this area is to establish clearly the atmosphere, the setting, the basic environment within which the faculty lives and works. He must define and make articulate the working philosophy of the institution with which they all are associated, its purposes, it opportunities, its methods, its ends. Within this broad framework, he has large responsibilities for the conditions under which the university seeks to achieve its objectives. By word and deed he sets "the tone" of the environment, and the qualitative level of the operation. He must be in a position to make clear what quality means and the exact degree to which excellence is being sought in staff matters.

The nature of the relationship between the teaching faculty and the adminstration can be traced directly to his doorstep. If his belief in the dignity and worth of the individual is real, it will transfer to his relationships with staff, and through him, to all other members of the administrative hierarchy as well. Thus, he establishes the "tone" of the personal relationships between all members of the staff, teachers, and administrators alike. While zealously maintaining and exercising his responsibility to administer the institution, he effectively involves competent personnel in the process of decision making and urges his administrative colleagues to do likewise. He makes clear his belief in specialized knowledge and ability, and takes full advantage of such capabilities as he attempts to govern the institution. Thus, he effectively improves the morale of the faculty by assuring them of their partnership in the educational enterprise.

The president is largely responsible for the organization of the institution, for the machinery by which it is administered. He also has a major part in determining the personnel to be given responsibility for administration and management. The clarity with which he establishes and defines responsibility, the degree to which he delegates, the intelligence with which he educates and the wisdom with which he leads, have much to do with the effectiveness of personnel operations and the morale of staff. Consultations must be held and advice must be secured, but also decisions must be made and those affected must be informed not only of actions but of their consequences. The skill of the president in assigning and delimiting responsibilities and in providing for the rapid but unhurried making of decisions has much to do with the success of the entire program.

The president must understand the conditions under which faculty are likely to do their best work, and do everything within his power to provide the substance necessary to establish such conditions. He must also indoctrinate his administrative colleagues with the same philosophy. He is a facilitator not an inhibitor, but there must be direction and design to the work of facilitation. It is almost as important that the faculty recognize this attitude in the central administration as it is that a fine working environment be developed. For the staff to know and believe that the president understands their needs if they are to accomplish their missions at a top qualitative level is certainly the first and a most important step in achieving institutional goals. The manner in which the president works in his many relationships is as important, if not more so, than the actual decisions he and his colleagues make from day to day.

The Role of the Academic Dean

In the liberal arts college, the dean shares with the department head the responsibility for administering the faculty personnel program, and next to the head, is most intimately associated with the acquisition and retention of staff. In many ways, he exercises for a wider and more diverse group, responsibilities similar to those of a department head for a more homogeneous segment of personnel. Certainly, in conjunction with the head, he is largely responsible for developing and maintaining excellence in the faculty of the college.

It is the dean's responsibility, within total university policy, to direct the development of a long-range plan for faculty personnel within the college as a whole. It is incumbent upon him to determine in conference with his colleagues and in conjunction with central administrative officials, the emphasis to be given various departments in the college. He must direct the evolution of a long-range plan for personnel, establish the bases for assessing merit, and determine upon the techniques and procedures to be followed in evaluation. On the one hand, he must act as a friendly but firm judge of the quality and appropriateness of personnel recommendations arising in the various departments, and, on the other, as a strong protagonist for such proposals before the central administration, once they have passed his scrutiny and received his approval. He must assess carefully all recommendations in terms of the needs of the departments concerned, but at the same time remain mindful of the general university framework within which the college is operating, and the fiscal limitations of the institution as a whole. To accomplish his assignment successfully, he must have the confidence of his colleagues in central administration as well as those in departments of the college which he administers.

The central administration will and should expect the dean to make recommendations which he is willing to support as his own and, thus, to be a responsible academic administrator. On the other hand, his department heads and the faculty generally will insist that he respect their competencies as well as their judgments in personnel matters. In fact, the central administrative officers as well ordinarily will urge him to consult in some fashion with his colleagues as he attempts to arrive at decisions on personnel.

The dean's leadership must be of sufficient strength that ordinarily his recommendations will have the support of his colleagues, and where occasionally this is not possible, he must be able to negate departmental desires without developing undue antagonism or resentment. Such vetos are more effective if they are rare in occurrence and if they are utilized only after every possible effort has been made to ameliorate or eliminate differences of opinion. The successful dean will avoid many head-on collisions by anticipating difficulties, dealing informally with his staff in advance of formal recommendations and working within well-defined and understood policies, plans, and procedures.

There is considerable evidence that where both an all-university and a college reviewing committee exist - each of which considers individual appointments, promotions, tenure, or salary adjustments - such duplication of effort tends to lead to unwise overlap, undue delay in decisions, and considerable irritation when a difference of opinion develops between the two committees. Thus, it would seem best where a general university reviewing committee is in operation to avoid a similar committee at the school or college level.[3]

On the other hand, there is good reason to suggest the provision of a committee on policies and plans to advise the dean widely and comprehensively including the area of faculty personnel. This committee should be available to the dean for consultation at his request, should be empowered to originate suggestions, and should carry on a continuing review of policies and practices concerned with the acquisition and management of faculty personnel within the college framework. It clearly should be advisory and not administrative in nature.

The dean should do more than serve the negative function of veto or delay in connection with departmental recommendations. Basically, his assignment is a positive one which involves stimulating and encouraging the staff and the departments to achieve at the optimum level. When it is decided something is worth doing and that it is not contrary to policy, he should do everything in his power to aid the department to achieve the desired end. He should be prepared to stimulate the sluggish or moribund, to reward the strong, and to redirect the department which seems confused or misguided. If necessary, he should be prepared to take direct action, but only as a last resort.

The direct participation of the dean in personnel matters should vary considerably with the nature of the problem involved. He should rarely take the initiative in the acquisition of staff, for example. Since ordinarily he has wide professional associations, he should never hesitate, however, to offer a name for consideration but only as any other member of the staff would do. Basically, his major role is that of review to determine whether in his judgment the department has followed accepted policies and procedures, whether they have arrived at a recommendation which fits defined needs, and whether the proposal is of such character as to meet fully the approved standards of quality. In appointing heads of departments, of course, the dean must take leadership and be fully convinced before an appointment is made.

On promotions and tenure decisions the dean should take a somewhat more active part. While, ordinarily, he is not in position to make a personal judgment on the professional qualifications of the individual, he can compare the candidates of one department with those being recommended by others and assess relative merit across the entire scope of the college. It is his responsibility to maintain some sort of balance in these matters, or to be able to explain variations from the norm both to the central administration and to the faculty. He does not originate the data on which decisions are reached, and is not required to substitute his judgment of professional qualifications for evaluations made by departmental colleagues, but he must be prepared to weigh the validity of such judgments in comparison with like proposals from other departments.

---

[3] It should be pointed out that the writer does not suggest such reviewing committees at either the college or the university level, but only committees to advise on policies and plans.

The dean should take even greater responsibility for merit salary adjustments. Here he must work with the raw materials presented to him by the department head in each case. His problem is to evaluate these data in relation to those he receives from other departments and, in the end, to determine which personnel are most deserving of preferred treatment. If he questions the facts upon which the recommendation is based, he should attempt to determine their validity through independent checks of his own, but fundamentally he must weigh the merits of the case presented by one department against that from another, where the individuals concerned have roughly similar status.

The dean also represents a key point in the university's system of communications. It is his responsibility to make certain that the faculty is fully informed of policies, procedures, and methods followed in the personnel program. He can easily present a barrier to the spread of information originating in the central offices and, thus, have a poorly informed faculty. On the other hand, he can make certain that adequate machinery exists for the free and rapid flow of information to the end that the staff is well informed on developments. The latter condition will not exist unless there is a clearly designed program of information service, and definite machinery operating automatically to transfer information both vertically and horizontally.

The dean must facilitate communications up as well as down the line. It is one of his important obligations to keep the central administration informed of the program, plans, needs, and accomplishments of the college and its various departments. Only when the president and his staff are fully informed can they be expected to support the individual personnel recommendations necessary to implement the program. If the central staff is well aware of the care with which long-range plans for personnel are developed, the intelligent procedures used in evaluating staff for appointment and promotion, and the manner in which policies, needs, and machinery are constantly reviewed and improved, these leaders can be expected to give the kind of support necessary to the successful attainment of the contemplated ends.

Reference in this section has been made frequently to the dean of the college of liberal arts with little mention of like officials in the professional schools. As has been stated, the responsibilities are similar except professional schools ordinarily are not organized formally into departments. Thus, the professional dean combines many of the responsibilities which are shared by the dean and the department head in the liberal arts college. At times, in the absence of formal "heads," the professional dean finds it wise to lean heavily for advice on the "head professor" in a given area of specialization. His basic responsibilities otherwise correspond to those of the dean of liberal arts.

The Role of the Department Head

The department is the single most important personnel agency and, as such, the key to staff quality. Here the search for new staff is instituted, here the standards of teaching performance and productivity are formulated and practiced, and here the environmental factors are most intimately associated with the professional growth and development of the individual professor. The health and morale of the department not only affect the quality of the contribution made by the area, but the excellence of the staff procured and its desire to remain with the institution as well.

The department head must be given real authority and responsibility. He should be expected to provide aggressive leadership to the area, and to accept full responsibility for the qualitative growth and development of the division. While he should advise fully with his colleagues, all recommendations relating to staff should come from him and he should be required to defend them as his decisions. The department head should be given considerable autonomy in operations, and broad flexibility in the management of personnel. He should be held accountable for all decisions on personnel and for the continuous evaluation and upgrading of staff.

Clearly, it is essential that the head be a strong and gifted leader and that he have the full confidence of the dean and the president. Since he is expected to exert major influence on departmental development, he must be wisely and carefully selected. Both the dean and the president must participate in the appointment, but the former must play the principal role. The wishes and attitudes of the departmental staff should be considered fully, but no head should be appointed who is not acceptable to the dean and president, or who will not have their full confidence.

The headship is too important to be handled on a rotating basis even in the large departments. It takes time to become oriented to such an assignment, and the responsibility demands continuing, long-term planning. The head, therefore, should be appointed for a five-year term and should be eligible to serve two or possibly three terms. Under no circumstances should the post be considered a permanent one, and as has been mentioned, tradition should involve the reassignment of heads to other duties if and when such action is in the best interests of the department and university.

This is not to suggest the development of an arbitrary, authoritative, autocratic leadership in the department. On the contrary, it is at this point that real participation on the part of staff makes sense, in fact is essential. The established procedures for administering personnel, therefore, should involve checks at various points along the way to determine whether and to what degree faculty has been consulted in the decision-making process. The important elements are two: (1) the faculty must be consulted in such fashion and at such time as to permit their attitudes and judgments to influence decisions, and (2) the head must not relinquish his responsibility to make the decisions at the departmental level and to forward them to his dean. Whether the faculty is consulted formally or informally, individually or in groups is not the critical factor - the essential element is that they be consulted, and that they believe their opinions have an influence on decisions.

Neither does it matter especially if the head delegates certain of his responsibilities to other individuals or groups within the department, so long as it is clear that he cannot relinquish his authority or responsibility to make the final decision at this level. Normally, when delegation is made, he will accept the recommendations which come to him from such personnel, but he must make the decision and defend it as his before his colleagues in administration. This arrangement will work well where the head truly wants to make his judgments within a framework of widespread consultation and advice, and at the same time possesses the strength to make decisions even when they vary from such counsel, and to justify them before his staff. The weak administrator is much more likely to avoid consultation if it places him in the delicate situation of occasionally deciding contrary to majority opinion, since he lacks the intestinal fortitude for such a task.

The spirit and tone which characterize an operation are more important than the mechanisms which are provided, and these qualities are supplied by the people involved in the operation. If men believe they can make suggestions even though their proposals may be contrary to the beliefs of the head, and that these suggestions are fully and intelligently considered as a solution is sought, the decision itself or the procedures by which it is reached are relatively unimportant. This is the kind of leadership which should be sought and when it is found should be given wide freedom of movement. Under such circumstances, the strong and wise head will keep his staff well informed and will give them a real sense of participation in important matters without ever relinquishing either his authority or responsibility for the decisions once they are made.

The Role of the Faculty

The problem of faculty participation in personnel activities, simply stated, is how to give them an appropriate and meaningful part and at the same time protect them in their basic assignments - teaching and research or scholarship. This result can be achieved only by differentiating clearly between administration and management on the one hand, and faculty participation on the other. There is considerable confusion in this area, so much so that at times the result is the development of what in reality are two sets of administrative officials, one formal and one informal, the latter made up of teaching faculty members who take considerable time to do those things the administrative staff is employed to handle and at the expense of those duties which they are uniquely equipped to assume.

It is entirely logical and appropriate for the faculty to be interested in the selection and advancement of their colleagues, particularly in related areas of specialization. They must work closely with such personnel, their own achievement is linked in considerable measure with that of others in the same field, and they must assume in some measure a part of the responsibility for the success of the institution beyond their own direct contribution. On the other hand, the major responsibility of the faculty member is teaching and research, and nothing should be permitted to infringe unduly upon concentration in these areas. The question, therefore, seems to be: *How can the faculty participate most effectively in staff personnel activities without either excessively diverting themselves from their basic duties or unwisely infringing on the proper and essential role and responsibilities of administration and management?*

The answer to this question involves the faculty at two extremes of the operation in somewhat different ways. In the first place, they must participate in the development of basic policies and plans which relate to the faculty personnel program. The administration, of course, is responsible for constructing the policies and procedures upon which the personnel program rests, and for directing the operations. In developing the policies and the machinery, however, it is incumbent upon administrative officials to seek and be affected by the advice and counsel of the faculty as partners in the educational enterprise. The policies are not those of the administration but of the university, and thus they should be representative of the best thinking of those who provide the substance for the university's effort. Most universities are too large to secure such advice from the total faculty on a purely democratic basis, and anyway this is a most awkward way to proceed in an area of such complexity. Thus participation, of necessity, will be confined to a smaller representative group selected from the total faculty and responsive in considerable measure to the thinking of the group.

This representative committee should be utilized fully by administration as highly qualified professional consultants. Presumably it would be composed of some of the best and most imaginative minds available, and the administrator should utilize the opportunity to secure the most meaningful and intelligent advice available. The committee should concentrate on principles, policies, and ends rather than means as such. Protection should be provided against involving the group in management, and committee members as well as administrators should resist stoutly any tendency in this direction. Every effort should be made to conserve the time of committee-men and to use them as top-level consultants. A staff should be provided to handle necessary routine, conduct the required research activities, and process the data necessary to the deliberations of the group. In this way, and only in this way, can such an organization make a fundamental contribution to policy and its assessment in practice.

In the end, the policy decisions must be made by the administrator rather than by the faculty, since ordinarily he accepts responsibility for their consequences in action. The real root of the matter is whether he honestly and sincerely seeks the advice of his colleagues, and whether he gives full consideration to such counsel as he approaches a decision on policy. If it is clear that he really wants such advice and depends heavily upon it as he ponders his decision, the fact that occasionally it is necessary to deviate from such advice becomes relatively unimportant, particularly if he frankly and unreservedly explains the "good and sufficient" reasons for such variation at an appropriate time. Most of the bitterness that professors display results from a belief either that their judgments in an area where they are qualified to contribute are not requested, or if sought, are really not given fundamental consideration in the decision-making process.

All basic policy matters affecting personnel should be handled in this manner, including those which undergird the recruitment and selection of staff, promotions, tenure, and merit salary adjustments. The faculty committee should make a continuing review of the basic assumptions and discuss regularly with the administrator revisions which would, in their judgment, improve the effectiveness of the program. To do this well, they will find it necessary to make, through staff, a continuing analysis of operations in order to suggest modifications or improvements in the policies under which the program is functioning.

The suggestion of a formalized method for securing faculty advice has been associated to this point with the central administration of the university, but it has equal merit at the school or college level and possibly in the larger departments as well. The dean, working within the framework of total university policy, will find it equally desirable to establish basic principles upon which the faculty personnel activities in the special area over which he presides are to be founded. It is as essential here as in the broader university environment, to secure the professional advice and counsel of a representative faculty group selected democratically from the total college body and, in a sense, acting for it. The dean must make the basic decisions and is responsible for administering them, but his judgments on policies and plans should be reached only after intelligent consultation with such a group and full consideration of their advice. Ordinarily the dean's opinion will coincide with that of the majority, but where he is in disagreement for what he considers good reasons, he must take action as his mind and conscience dictate. However, if he gives the faculty group reason to believe that their advice has been fully and carefully considered, and if he makes clear the reason for his deviation, there should be no serious weakening of confidence or morale as a result.

Such groups are referred to as committees on policies, and plans, and basically this should be their function. However, occasionally the administrative official concerned may wish to review a special case with the faculty representatives as much to test policies as to secure a specific reaction. Also, in rare instances the committee itself may ask to review an individual recommendation. There should be relatively little of this sort of thing and when it is done it should serve either (1) to provide a check on the basic policy factors concerned, or (2) to make clear to the faculty generally that their colleagues on the committee occasionally make spot checks of operations to determine whether or not the program is serving the desired ends and operating in a fair and impartial manner. It should be clear to all concerned that in these activities, as well as others, the committee is advisory in nature with no authority to make changes in official recommendations. However, the very fact that as a result of such faculty counsel on critical cases the administrator may conceivably request reinforcement or further support of the original recommendation should encourage the faculty to believe that all such proposals are examined critically by the central administration. This practice should also encourage administrative officers consistently to use great care in documenting and supporting their recommendations on personnel.

It was stated earlier that the answer to the question of faculty participation is likely to involve such personnel at two extremes of the operation. To this point the discussion has been concerned with the first type of participation, that which involves a representative faculty group in the development of policies and plans both at the university and the college or school level. It is now time to look at the second extreme, that approach which involves participation in specific personnel determinations at the departmental level or its counterpart in the nondepartmentalized professional school. While the department head or the dean of the professional unit must make and take responsibility for all such decisions, it is at this level of operations that faculty generally should play a direct and significant part.

Faculty advice and consultation should be sought in a number of ways, most of them informal in nature. In some cases it is best to secure reactions on an individual basis, in others group discussion should prevail. At times it is more appropriate to talk with the entire department, at others with senior staff, and occasionally with only one or two key members. Any staff member should feel free to suggest possibilities for vacancies as they develop or are anticipated. Probably the entire departmental faculty should be involved in discussing the long-range plans for departmental development and the personnel necessary to achieve the job. On the other hand, a smaller group selected carefully should advise on such matters as (1) detailed policies and plans, (2) the promotion of or granting tenure to specific individuals, (3) the definition of requirements for a specific position, and (4) the selection of preferred candidates in a given area of specialization.

How much formality should be involved in providing faculty participation at this level is really a function of the specific circumstances and the personnel involved. The writer is inclined to the informal approach although it must be admitted that large departments tend to force a more ritualistic management. Certainly formal voting should be avoided in favor of the less ceremonial "consensus of minds." Under no circumstances should a tradition be developed requiring unanimous agreement for the head to proceed. At times he might be swayed in his decision by the cogent objections of one man, but at others he may be unmoved by criticisms of the majority.

As has been said repeatedly, the controlling factor is the spirit which characterizes the operation, and the atmosphere under which it is conducted. If each staff member believes that his point of view really matters, that it is given the consideration it deserves, he is likely to assume he is "on the team" and react accordingly. The department head's door must be open to all the staff to be sure, but it is much more important that his mind be open to their suggestions and advice intelligently conceived and cogently presented.

A clear recognition of the respective roles of the faculty and the administration should have one other very noteworthy result. It should lead to a major reduction in the number of standing committees and in the time devoted to those which remain. Committees can serve a real function in higher education, but the committee structure of the typical university is completely unjustifiable under any kind of sensible standard of evaluation. There should not only be fewer committees but the time devoted to meetings should be considerably reduced.

In the first place, all standing committees which are operational rather than advisory should be eliminated. In the second place, committees which overlap in function or which unduly segment an area of service should be consolidated. In the third place, those committees which have outgrown their usefulness or never served any real purpose should be discharged.

When these reorganizations have been completed there should remain a relatively small number of standing committees each having an important function, each advisory in character, and each dealing with policies, plans, and principles rather than the details of operation. The objectives to be attained by each should be clarified, the necessary assistance provided to do the essential staff work, and careful agenda prepared for each meeting. The sessions should be devoted to the discussion of basic issues which have been identified and upon which advice is desired. This sort of careful planning and directed effort, supported by intensive staff work, should make it possible for the committee-members to concentrate on important issues and to make unique and important contributions with half the effort spent today on what many times are trivial and unimportant matters.

The administrator today finds it difficult to maintain his role as educational leader of the university, not only because others are interested in substituting their leadership for his, but primarily because he has permitted himself to become entwined with so many time-consuming tasks of management that he has little time left for the important educational issues. As Robert Hutchins has said, he is so busy with the urgent he cannot think of the important. Now we also observe that the faculty, in its desire to help with the formulation of educational policy, the definition of goals, and the management of personnel, likewise getting itself so involved in machinery that these efforts are at best ineffective and at the worst real deterrents to accomplishment. At times one can almost believe that neither the faculty nor the admintration is able to concentrate in satisfactory manner on the major educational issues which must be resolved if the university is to make real progress. It is for this reason primarily that roles must be clarified, machinery simplified, and confidence in the possibility of joint accomplishment restored if chaos is to be avoided.

The major role of the faculty is teaching and research, and the critical assignment of administration is the facilitation and improvement of these efforts to the end that the mission of the university may be accomplished at a high qualitative level. But faculty are not employees to be directed by management in somewhat robot fashion. They are highly specialized professional workers whose thinking, attitudes of mind, and judgments must be utilized as guides to the development and direction of the program. Wise administrative leadership involves a search for and reaction to faculty viewpoints not only because this approach improves faculty morale, but basically for the reason that this is the best way to insure a sound and effective program. Likewise, faculty should respond to such leadership with the realization that it can be effective only if they accept it fully and confidently as best for the university as well as for themselves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Byse, Clark, and Louis Joughin. *Tenure in American Higher Education: Plans, Practices and the Law*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1959.

Caplow, Theodore, and Reece J. McGee. *The Academic Marketplace*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

Dickhoff, John S. *The Domain of the Faculty in Our Expanding Colleges*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.

Greenough, William C. *College Retirement and Insurance Plans*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948.

Hofstadter, R., and W. P. Metzger. *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Wagner Thielens, Jr. *The Academic Mind*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press Publishers, 1958.

Stoke, Harold. *The American College President*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Wilson, Logan. *The Academic Man*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Woodburne, Lloyd S. *Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

______. *Principles of College and University Administration*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958.

PERIODICALS

"Academic Freedom and Tenure, Statements of Principles," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, 43:113-118, March, 1957.

Button, D. E. "Retirement Practices of State Universities," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, 43:492-497, September, 1957.

Harris, Seymour E. "Faculty Salaries," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, 43:581-593, December, 1957.

"Salaries in Higher Education," *National Education Association Research Bulletin*, 36:90-95, October, 1958.

"Statement of Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 44, No. 1A (March, 1958), pp. 270-274.

Trippet, B. K. "The Role of the Faculty in College Administration," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, 43:484-491, September, 1957.

Walters, Raymond. "Statistics of Attendance in American Universities and Colleges," *School and Society*, 86:427-440, December 6, 1958.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Bokelman, W. Robert. *Higher Education Planning and Management Data, 1958-59*. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Circular No. 549. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959.

Darley, John G. "How Does a College or University Build Effective Inter-Departmental and Inter-School Cooperation and Coordination?" *Current Issues in Higher Education, 1954*, pp. 159-163. Washington: Association for Higher Education (a Department of the National Education Association of the United States), 1954.

Fuchs, Ralph. "Nature and Sources of Faculty-Administration Tension, Comments," *Faculty-Administration Relationships*, pp. 20-24. Washington: American Council on Education, 1958.

Petry, Loren C. "Nature and Sources of Faculty-Administration Tension, A Faculty View," *Faculty-Administration Relationships*, pp. 12-20. Washington: American Council on Education, 1958.

Ruml, Beardsley, and Sidney Tickton. *Teaching Salaries Then and Now - A 50-Year Comparison with Other Occupations and Industries*. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1955.

Wilson, Logan. "Nature and Sources of Faculty-Administration Tension, A President's Perspective," *Faculty-Administration Relationships*, pp. 1-12. Washington: American Council on Education, 1958.

APPENDIX

OUTLINE TO SERVE AS GENERAL GUIDE FOR INTERVIEWS IN THE STUDY OF FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES IN SELECTED STATE UNIVERSITIES

H. K. Newburn

I. RECRUITING STAFF

A. General Philosophy (what it is and attitude toward it)

1. Officials in State Government
2. University Governing Board
3. University Administration (General)
4. Deans of Schools and Colleges
5. Faculty

B. General Policies (what they are and attitude toward them)

1. State Legislature and other state bodies
2. University Board of Control
3. University Administration
4. Faculty
5. Copies of formal actions regarding policies

C. Anticipation of Vacancies

1. Timing
2. Listing of institutions and persons to contact for suggestions
    a. How established
3. Development of list of possibilities
    a. How established
    b. How supported
    c. How used
4. Planned personnel acquisition program

D. Identification of Specific Candidates (to be treated in turn for several faculty ranks, for Deans and for all-university administrators)

1. Procedure (copies of printed material relating to procedure)
    a. Definition of requirements of position
    b. Description of necessary qualifications
    c. Determination of rank, salary, tenure, etc.

    d. First and continuing inquiries
    e. Integrating independent applications
    f. Recommendations (written and oral)
    g. Developing a select list of candidates
    h. Personal interviews
    i. Relations with present employer

E. Making the Appointment

  1. Procedure
    a. Decision to recommend
    b. Receiving candidates' acceptance
    c. Receiving present employers' approval
    d. Recommendation
    e. Review
    f. Approval and appointment

F. Responsibilities of Following Personnel (copies of printed statements)

  1. Faculty Committee (Internal-External)
  2. Departmental Staff
  3. Department Head
  4. Dean
  5. All-University Administrator
  6. President
  7. Board of Control

G. Communication Preceding and During Process

  1. Inter-faculty
  2. Administration-faculty
  3. With candidates
  4. With current employer of candidates
  5. With Board of Control

Note: Specific illustrative cases will be analyzed to provide data indicating what actually happens.

II. PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. General Philosophy

  1. State Government officials
  2. Governing Board of University
  3. General University Administration
  4. Deans of Schools and Colleges

5. Department Heads
6. Faculty

B. General Policies (copies of printed statements)

1. State Legislature or other state bodies
2. University Board of Control
3. Administration
4. Faculty

C. Promotion

1. Definition of requirements for each rank
    - a. Items included
    - b. How defined
    - c. Time factor
    - d. Limitations on number in any rank

2. Procedure (copies of printed statements)
    - a. Timing
    - b. Origination of recommendations (and the basis of support)
    - c. Review of recommendations
    - d. Approval of recommendations

D. Tenure

1. Definition of requirements to be met
    - a. Items included
    - b. How defined and supported
    - c. Time factor
    - d. Relation to rank held

2. Procedure (copies of printed statements)
    - a. Timing
    - b. Origination and basis of recommendations
    - c. Review of recommendations
    - d. Approval of recommendations and action

E. Responsibilites of Following in Promotions and Tenure Decisions:

1. Governing Board
2. General University Administration
3. Deans and Department Heads
4. General Faculty Committee (Internal-External)

F. Communication Preceding and During Process

1. Administration and faculty member involved
2. Administration and general faculty
3. Administration and Board of Control
4. General Publicity

Note: Specific cases illustrating what actually happens will be collected.

III. SALARY PROGRAM

A. General Philosophy

1. State authorities (especially legislature)
2. Governing Board
3. Administration (General)
4. Deans and Department Heads
5. Faculty

B. General Policies (collect printed materials)

1. Legislature or other state agencies
2. University Board of Control
3. Administration
4. Faculty

C. Salary Schedule or Scale

1. Informal or formal (copies of data)
2. How established
3. Provisions for
    a. Minimums-maximums by ranks
    b. Automatic increases
    c. Merit increments
    d. Range within ranks
    e. Absolute ceilings
    f. Outside fees

D. Procedure in Handling Salary Adjustments (copies of printed material)

1. Determination of general pattern
2. Establishing base for legislative request
3. Evaluation of staff as basis for specific adjustments
4. Determination of specific salaries to be recommended
5. Review of specific proposals
6. Approval and action on recommendations
7. Provision for appeal and final review
8. Timing of above steps

E. Responsibilities of Following in Making Salary Adjustments:

1. Governing Board
2. General University Administration
3. Deans and Department Heads
4. Departmental Faculty
5. Faculty Committee (Internal-External)

F. Communication Preceding and During Process

1. Between Faculty Member and Department Head
2. Between Faculty Member and Dean
3. Between Faculty Committee and Faculty Member
4. Between General Administration and Dean, Department Head, Faculty Member or Faculty Committee
5. Between Administration and General Faculty
6. General Publicity

Note: Illustrative cases as in I and II.

IV. PROVISIONS FOR FACULTY WELFARE

A. General Philosophy

B. General Policies (copies of printed statements)

C. General Provisions

1. Leaves of absence
    a. Sabbatical or similar
    b. Others with pay
    c. Sick leaves
2. Faculty grants for research and writing
3. Expenses for official activities, travel, etc.
4. Special adjustments in schedule for research and writing
5. Provision of research or teaching fellows
6. Office space, secretarial assistance and other facilities
7. Provisions for faculty housing
8. Insurance program - medical, surgical, life
9. Special commendations
10. Distinguished professorships

D. Responsibilities of Following in Provisions for Faculty Welfare:

1. Departmental Staff
2. Department Heads
3. Deans
4. President (or other all-university administrator)
5. Faculty Committee
6. Board

E. Provisions for Appropriate Communication

1. Horizontal
2. Vertical
3. General Publicity

Note: Cases as in foregoing units.

V. RETIREMENT

A. General Philosophy

B. Provisions (copies of Statements)

1. Financial contributions of
    a. University
    b. Individual
2. Financial provisions in retirement
3. Age for retirement
    a. Voluntary
    b. Compulsory
    c. Variations for administrative officers
    d. Flexibility in retirement age

C. Preparation for Retirement

1. Formal program
2. Informal arrangements

D. Responsibility of Institution for Retired Personnel

1. Title in retirement
2. Office space, other facilities
3. Privileges
4. Responsibilities

E. How Policy is Determined

  1. Part played by
    a. Legislature or other state agencies
    b. Board of Control
    c. General Administration
    d. Faculty

F. Provisions for Appropriate Communication

Note: Again cases where possible.

VI. SEPARATION FROM UNIVERSITY

A. Personnel Without Tenure

  1. Policy (copies of statements)
  2. Procedure
    a. Initiation of decision
    b. Recommendation
    c. Review and approval
    d. Notification
    e. Timing of each step
    f. Separation pay
  3. Responsible agents or agencies
  4. Limits to retention without tenure

B. Personnel With Tenure

  1. General policy (copies of statements)
  2. Causes for separation
  3. How determined and by whom
  4. Procedural requirements
  5. Separation pay
  6. Notification
  7. Timing
  8. Inter-communication with those involved including faculty

Note: Supporting cases will be used to illustrate operation of policies.

TABLE 10

AVERAGE AGE WHEN PROMOTED TO FULL PROFESSOR*

INSTITUTION	TOTAL UNIV.		LIBERAL ARTS		ENGIN.& TECH.		BUSIN. ADMIN.		LAW		EDUCATION	
	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age
I	84	44	31	44	11	45	10	49	1	39	5	44
II	327	44	163	44	68	41	14	42	3	36	7	44
III	56	42	17	40	11	41	4	42	2	42	4	46
IV	139	45	92	46	0	0	17	41	4	38	16	46
V	314	44	167	44	60	45	19	41	18	37	19	47
VI	270	44	99	48	52	43	12	39	7	37	25	45
VII	173	43	63	44	34	43	17	41	4	36	9	47
VIII	61	46	24	47	12	48	1	51	0	0	4	48
IX	158	41	119	41	2	47	9	40	11	39	5	45
X	161	43	86	42	20	43	9	41	14	37	11	45
XI	102	42	49	43	7	39	6	41	4	39	15	43
TOTALS	1845	43.5	910	43.5	277	43.0	118	41.6	68	37.6	120	45.2

*Does not include those appointed originally as full professor.

TABLE 11

FULL PROFESSORS - AVERAGE TERM OF YEARS AT RANK OF INSTRUCTOR

INSTITUTION	TOTAL UNIV.		LIBERAL ARTS		ENGIN.& TECH.		BUSIN. ADMIN.		LAW		EDUCATION	
	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years
I	28	4	16	5	2	5	2	3	0	0	0	0
II	100	3	55	3	26	3	1	2	0	0	1	2
III	11	3	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
IV	39	5	32	5	0	0	2	6	0	0	2	6
V	441	4	212	5	88	4	30	5	28	2	27	6
VI	127	6	40	5	27	4	5	4	3	7	11	5
VII	80	5	28	6	16	4	7	3	1	5	0	0
VIII	32	5	10	5	5	6	0	0	0	0	2	7
IX	62	5	56	5	1	4	0	0	1	1	3	2
X	87	5	55	5	11	5	6	4	0	0	4	3
XI	33	4	14	4	4	4	1	6	0	0	4	4
TOTALS	1040	4.5	524	4.7	181	4.1	54	4.4	33	2.5	54	3.0

TABLE 12

FULL PROFESSORS - AVERAGE TERM OF YEARS AT RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

INSTITUTION	TOTAL UNIV.		LIBERAL ARTS		ENGIN.& TECH.		BUSIN. ADMIN.		LAW		EDUCATION	
	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years
I	60	4	23	5	6	4	8	6	1	4	5	3
II	230	5	122	5	48	4	6	4	1	7	2	4
III	32	4	12	5	6	4	2	5	1	2	3	4
IV	93	5	60	5	0	0	13	5	3	3	8	3
V	441	5	212	5	88	6	30	4	28	3	27	6
VI	207	5	75	5	44	6	6	3	4	4	18	4
VII	142	4	55	4	29	4	15	3	2	3	6	5
VIII	47	7	16	8	9	10	0	0	0	0	3	3
IX	103	4	88	4	2	3	3	4	4	2	3	9
X	110	5	70	5	11	6	8	3	5	3	7	6
XI	84	5	40	4	6	3	5	3	4	4	10	6
TOTALS	1549	4.9	773	4.8	249	5.4	96	4.0	53	3.1	92	5.0

TABLE 13

FULL PROFESSORS - AVERAGE TERM OF YEARS AT RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

INSTITUTION	TOTAL UNIV.		LIBERAL ARTS		ENGIN.& TECH.		BUSIN. ADMIN.		LAW		EDUCATION	
	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years	No. Persons	Aver. Years
I	84	6	31	6	11	4	10	9	1	3	5	4
II	329	6	165	6	68	5	14	5	2	2	7	6
III	55	6	17	6	11	5	4	5	2	5	4	6
IV	139	7	92	7	0	0	17	5	4	5	16	5
V	441	6	212	7	88	6	30	4	28	4	27	5
VI	270	6	99	6	52	6	12	4	7	3	25	6
VII	173	6	63	7	35	6	17	6	4	2	9	6
VIII	58	7	23	8	11	6	1	18	0	0	3	7
IX	155	6	117	6	2	9	8	6	11	6	5	5
X	160	6	87	6	19	5	9	6	14	4	11	6
XI	100	4	47	5	7	4	6	5	4	2	15	4
TOTALS	1964	5.9	953	6.3	304	5.7	128	5.3	77	4.0	127	5.4

TABLE 14

FULL PROFESSORS - AVERAGE AGE AT APPOINTMENT TO STAFF

INSTITUTION	TOTAL UNIV.		LIBERAL ARTS		ENGIN.& TECH.		BUSIN. ADMIN.		LAW		EDUCATION	
	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age	No. Persons	Aver. Age
I	162	39	41	35	35	39	17	40	9	50	6	39
II	442	36	222	36	90	35	20	38	14	41	13	42
III	77	35	25	34	12	34	4	36	3	38	5	39
IV	220	38	146	38	0	0	22	33	13	40	19	40
V	441	36	213	35	88	35	29	40	29	36	27	40
VI	328	33	121	34	69	32	14	31	10	32	28	34
VII	206	34	68	32	46	35	18	32	8	40	12	38
VIII	71	31	28	32	12	31	1	27	0	0	5	32
IX	215	34	149	33	2	33	18	40	15	34	9	37
X	250	35	118	34	34	35	20	38	21	34	23	39
XI	112	34	51	34	10	34	6	33	4	33	17	36
TOTALS	2524	35	1182	35	398	35	169	37	126	37	164	38